LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
1800

Protestant Episcopal church in the United Sta
" Journal of the [illegible] Commission on memo
of Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg and others,
273

Memorial Papers.

THE

MEMORIAL:

WITH

CIRCULAR AND QUESTIONS

OF THE

EPISCOPAL COMMISSION;

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION; CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE COMMISSIONERS; AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM EPISCOPAL AND NON-EPISCOPAL DIVINES.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION, BY

RT. REV. ALONZO POTTER, D. D.,

ONE OF THE COMMISSION.

PHILADELPHIA:
PUBLISHED BY E. H. BUTLER & CO.
1857.

BX5840
A5

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1857, by

E. H. BUTLER & CO.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

44484

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 5

MEMORIAL 25

CIRCULAR AND QUESTIONS 33

REPORT OF COMMISSION 41

CONTRIBUTIONS OF COMMISSIONERS.

Bishop DOANE, (N. J.) 83

Bishop POTTER, (Pa.) 101

Bishop BURGESS, (Maine) 113

Bishop WILLIAMS, Assistant, (Conn.) 140

COMMUNICATIONS.

I. EPISCOPAL DIVINES.

Bishop MEADE, (Va.) 153

Bishop POLK, (La.) 157

Bishop FREEMAN, (Arkansas) 169

Bishop UPFOLD, (Indiana) 188

Bishop SCOTT, (Oregon) 206

Dr. BOWMAN, (Lancaster, Pa.) 220

Dr. A. CLEVELAND COXE, (Baltimore, Md.) 226

Dr. CRAIK, (Louisville, Ky.) 231

Dr. HARRY CROSWELL, (New Haven, Conn.) 238

COMMUNICATIONS (Continued) PAGE

Dr. SAMUEL FULLER, (Andover, Mass.) 246

Dr. HENRY GREGORY, (Syracuse, N. Y.) 250

Dr. M. A. DE WOLFE HOWE, (Philadelphia) 255

Dr. WM. H. LEWIS, (Brooklyn, N. Y.) 261

Dr. W. A. MUHLENBERG, (New York City) 274

Dr. W. H. ODENHEIMER, (Philadelphia) 290

Dr. PAUL TRAPIER, (Charleston, S. C.) 297

Dr. EDWIN M. VAN DEUSEN, (Pittsburgh, Pa.) 323

Dr. FRANCIS VINTON, (New York City) 329

Rev. J. F. YOUNG, Assistant, Trinity Church, (New York City) . 332

II. NON-EPISCOPAL DIVINES.

From a PRESBYTERIAN DIVINE (Old School) 417

From a PRESBYTERIAN DIVINE (Old School) . . . 420

From a CONGREGATIONAL DIVINE 422

From a BAPTIST DIVINE 425

From a GERMAN REFORMED DIVINE 429

From a METHODIST DIVINE 435

INTRODUCTION.

The subjects discussed in this volume are of common interest to all Christians. How to qualify ministers of the Gospel to deal more successfully with the social necessities and the ethical and theological problems of the day—how to secure a more effective Christian nurture for the rising generation—how, by healthy and legitimate means, to render the Sanctuary and its services more attractive to young men—how to get from our laity more active co-operation in the work of evangelizing the irreligious, and building up in the faith those who name the name of Christ—in one word, how to secure for our own land, and for the world, a more pervading, interpenetrating life-power through the Gospel, are questions which belong exclusively to no one class or body of Christians. They are discussed here more immediately in connection with the Protestant Episcopal Church; but the principles involved concern all churches, and all earnest men. The discussion has the advantage of being conducted by a variety of independent minds, occupying different stand-points, and having a "diversity of gifts." The views presented, too, are in conformity with no foregone conclusion; but are the outspoken opinions of those who differ much now, and who can be brought to agree only through frank and kindly discussion.

A few words will explain the origin of the following papers.

The General Convention, held in New York, October, 1853, was marked by many signs of awakened zeal. Among these may be reckoned the inquiries which were raised by a Memorial, signed by several distinguished Presbyters, and presented to the Bishops. It suggested the general question, whether "the posture of our Church, with reference to the great moral and social necessities of the day," was all that could be desired or expected. It suggested, more especially, the inquiry whether her usefulness might not be enlarged by relaxing somewhat the rigidity of her Liturgical services, and by conferring her Orders on conditions something less stringent. That the Memorial expressed a widely prevalent feeling (one, however, of inquiry rather than of conviction) may be inferred from the fact* that it was referred by an unusually large majority of Bishops (20 to 4) to a Commission, with instructions "to take into consideration the subject thereof, receive any further communications in relation to the same, and report to the next General Convention."

The Commission consisted originally of five Bishops, but was subsequently enlarged by the addition of a sixth. The lamented

*The general interest in this subject may be inferred also from the subsequent action of Diocesan Conventions, a large number of which proclaimed the solicitude with which they awaited a Report upon it. For instance, the Diocese of Rhode Island (1856);—"Resolved, that while protesting against crude and presumptuous changes, from the mere spirit of change, and against the poor delusion that life can be made only out of organizations, yet we earnestly sympathize with the wish of the Memorialists that the great Catholic idea of the Church of Christ may be fully developed by more thoroughly adapting it to all the wants of the country and the times; and do, therefore, recommend the whole subject to the General Convention, for their most enlarged and thoughtful consideration." The Diocese of Pennsylvania (1856);—"Resolved, that the objects above contemplated (enlarged means of access to the neglected, and to Christians of other names,) are most desirable in themselves; that they appeal to the liveliest sympathies of the Christian heart, and that their grave consideration by the Chief Council of our Church will be an omen of prospective and future good.

"Resolved, that this Convention commend these objects to the earnest thought, the enlarged charity, and conservative prudence of their Right Reverend Fathers, and their brethren, &c., &c."

death, however, of Bishop Wainwright, of New York, soon reduced it to its original number. It was composed of Bishops Otey, Doane, A. Potter, Burgess, and Williams. It met during the interval between the two General Conventions (of 1853 and 1856); once at Hartford (Conn.), once at Newport (R. I.), twice at New York, and twice at Philadelphia. The conclusions to which it was brought were adopted *unanimously* and will be found at the close of the Report (pp. 71–78).

In applying itself to the question, how the capacity of the Church "to do the work of the Lord in this land and in this age" might be increased, the Commission felt bound to inquire first, whether essential improvements might not be reached without legislation, and without change in the Prayer Book, or in its use. Hence the *Questions* which stand first in the circular which they issued after their first meeting. The *second* class of questions referred more directly to liturgical matters and to means which the Memorialists had suggested for enlarging the ranks of our ministry, and for promoting unity among all Christians, but especially among Protestants.

The object of these inquiries was *first*, to ascertain as far as possible how far the more enlightened and influential of our people were prepared to sanction any change; *secondly*, to gain for the Commissioners the aid of those who were best qualified to afford it, and who occupied various positions; and *thirdly*, to present, not only to churchmen, but to others, subjects which merit more consideration than they have yet received.

Among the Communications received in reply, are some from distinguished divines, not of our communion. They were obtained by the Editor on his own private responsibility, and are now published by him for the same reason that he obtained them. To gain a large and complete view of a subject, often requires the aid of those who are somewhat remote from the centre of agitation, and who live under the influence of different associations. He, therefore, applied to eminent clergymen of different names, most of whom he had known intimately in

former years. He felt that on the ground of ancient friendship, as well as of a common interest in the extension of the Gospel, he could count upon a full and frank expression of their opinions. He was not disappointed. There are few of the *Communications* which are likely to be read with more profit than those which close this volume, and which are from gentlemen in different parts of the country, representing five different denominations of Christians, and universally respected for their piety, zeal, and intellectual power. As they were mostly of a private and informal nature, he has not felt at liberty to publish the names of the writers.

It is the occasion of much regret that several valuable Communications, made directly to the Commission, by clergymen and laymen of our Church, have been excluded by the unexpected size to which this volume has grown. Had such a result been foreseen, a larger page and a smaller type would have been adopted. The Editor is not without hope that some, at least, of these papers will see the light hereafter.

Some months before the Report of the Commission was made up, the Chairman requested each of the members to prepare a contribution towards it. To Bishop Doane was assigned the subject of *Christian Education* generally; to A. Potter, *Ordination and Church Comprehension;* to Bishop Burgess, *the Liturgical Question;* to Bishop Williams, *Ministerial Efficiency and Christian Brotherhood.* As these papers express freely individual opinions, and as it was expedient to embody in the General Report nothing which all who signed it could not cordially adopt, these *Contributions* were reserved and presented to the House of Bishops as an appendix to the Report. They will be found immediately after it (pp. 81–150).

In printing these papers as a contribution to the history of the Church, and as an offering on the altar of Christian unity and Christian zeal, it is hardly necessary to say that neither the Editor nor his associates on the Commission pledge themselves to any opinions advanced, not avowedly their own. A

free fraternal discussion is all that is aimed at. It so happens that of the Communications unexpectedly omitted, a large proportion (being from the younger clergy or from laymen) plead for change, in one or more respects, more earnestly than most of those inserted. If it be thought that, even in these last, there is too much of free criticism, we must remember that to point out real or supposed faults is the ungrateful duty of all who would contribute to the highest welfare of their Church. If its human arrangements, or our mode of working them, be really defective, the defect will be known to others though we may conceal it from ourselves. If, on the other hand, the faults pointed out are imaginary, no permanent mischief can result from strictures which provoke inquiry, and which become powerless as soon as they are proved to be unjust. Should those without attempt an ungenerous use of such strictures, it will redound to their own discredit rather than to ours; for few things command more respect or more confidence, than an ingenuous disposition to discover our defects and a resolute purpose to correct them. It may be added that a spirit of self-depreciation, and of change for the mere sake of change, is not that to which as a Communion we are most obnoxious.

Only a part of the recommendations made by the Commission were acted on. Those which contemplated legislation (such for example as the proposed change in Canon XLV. of 1832, and the proposed additions to the *Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings*), were reached at too late a stage of the session to be considered with sufficient care. These, therefore, with the whole subject of Liturgical Revision, remain to be disposed of hereafter. They will need the guidance of that calm and enlightened judgment which only time and discussion, and above all, God's grace, can secure.

As finally adopted, *the Preamble and Resolutions* are as follows:—

Whereas, The use of the Book of Common Prayer, as regulated by custom, has special reference to established parish

Churches and to a population already incorporated with the Church; and whereas, our actual work is, or should be, among many not yet connected with our congregations, or where there are no established parishes, or where said parishes are yet in their infancy;

And whereas, There are or may be in different Dioceses, peculiar emergencies arising out of the character or condition of certain portions of the population which demand some special services;

And whereas, The Book of Common Prayer should be so used as most effectually to cherish true devotion and set forth the gospel and work of Christ, and contribute to the extension of his kingdom among men;

And whereas, The House of Bishops have heretofore expressed opinions as to usages which may be allowed under existing Rubrics and Canons: Therefore,

Resolved, as the opinion of the Bishops,

1. That the Order of the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion Service, being separate offices, may, as in former times, be used separately under the advice of the Bishop of the Diocese.

2. That on special occasions, or at extraordinary services not otherwise provided for, ministers may, at their discretion, use such parts of the Book of Common Prayer, and such lesson or lessons from Holy Scripture, as shall in their judgment tend most to edification.

3. That the Bishops of the several Dioceses may provide such special services as, in their judgment, shall be required by the peculiar spiritual necessities of any class or portion of the population within said Diocese: provided that such services shall not take the place of the services or offices of the Book of Common Prayer in congregations capable of its use.

4. That in view of the desirableness of union amongst Christians, and as a pledge of willingness to communicate and receive information tending to that end, and in order to con-

ference, if occasion or opportunity should occur, this House will appoint, by ballot, a committee of five Bishops, as an organ of communication or conference with such Christian bodies or individuals as may desire it, to be entitled the *Commission on Church Unity*.

5. That in making the above appointment, it is clearly understood that the Commission is clothed with no authority to mature plans of union with other Christian bodies, or to propound expositions of doctrine and discipline.

Committee under last resolutions.

- Bishop BROWNELL,
- " McILVAINE,
- " A. POTTER,
- " ELLIOTT,
- " BURGESS."

Two questions may be raised in respect to these Resolutions.

1. What is their proper force and signification?

2. Did not the Bishops transcend their powers in passing them, or even in entertaining the Memorial at all?

This is not the place, nor in this volume is there room, for a full discussion of these questions.

The Editor contents himself, therefore, with the three following remarks; the justness of which, he thinks, will be vindicated by further reflection and experience.

First. The Resolutions respecting the use of the Prayer Book express simply the *opinion* of the Bishops, as to what, under existing laws, is allowable. They do not *recommend* that such liberties be everywhere taken; they merely recognise the right to take them, where there is sufficient occasion and where the right is exercised under proper limitations.

Second. Such an opinion from such a source was, at this time, the best way of preventing rash and unauthorized changes in our worship, and yet supplying relief and facilities which are felt, by earnest workers, to be indispensable.

Third. In giving such an opinion, the Bishops acted in con-

formity with their practice from the time the General Convention was first established, with rights which belong to every co-ordinate branch of a Legislature, and with proprieties as well as rights, which independent of their relation to the General Convention, pertain to them as the Fathers of the Church.

A. P.

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 13, 1857.

Memorial.

MEMORIAL.

TO THE BISHOPS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH, IN COUNCIL ASSEMBLED.

Right Reverend Fathers: —

The undersigned, presbyters of the Church of which you have the oversight, venture to approach your venerable body with an expression of sentiment, which their estimate of your office in relation to the times does not permit them to withhold. In so doing, they have confidence in your readiness to appreciate their motives and their aims.

The actual posture of our Church, with reference to the great moral and social necessities of the day, presents to the minds of the undersigned a subject of grave and anxious thought. Did they suppose that this was confined to themselves, they would not feel warranted in submitting it to your attention; but, they believe it to be participated in by many of their brethren, who may not have seen the expediency of declaring their views, or at least a mature season for such a course.

The divided and distracted state of our American Protestant Christianity; the new and subtle forms of unbelief, adapting themselves with fatal success to the spirit of the age; the consolidated forces of Romanism, bearing with renewed skill and activity against the Protestant faith; and, as more or less the consequence of these, the utter ignorance of the Gospel among so large a portion of the lower classes of our population, making a heathen world in our midst: are among the considerations which induce your memorialists to present the inquiry whether the period has not arrived for the adoption of measures, to meet these exigencies of the times, more comprehensive than any yet provided for by our present ecclesiastical system: in other words, whether the Protestant Episcopal Church, with only her present canonical means and appliances, her fixed and invariable modes of public worship, and her traditional customs and usages, is competent to the work of preaching and dispensing the Gospel to all sorts and conditions of men, and so adequate to do the work of the Lord in this land and in this age? This question, your petitioners, for their own part, and in consonance with many thoughtful minds among us, believe must be answered in the negative. Their memorial proceeds on the assumption that our Church, confined to the exercise of her present system, is not sufficient to the great purposes above mentioned; that a wider door must be opened for admission to the Gospel ministry, than that through which her candidates for holy orders are now obliged

to enter. Besides such candidates among her own members, it is believed that men can be found among the other bodies of Christians around us, who would gladly receive ordination at your hands, could they obtain it without that entire surrender, which would now be required of them, of *all* the liberty in public worship to which they have been accustomed; men, who could not bring themselves to conform in all particulars to our prescriptions and customs, but yet sound in the faith, and who, having the gifts of preachers and pastors, would be able ministers of the New Testament. With deference it is asked, ought such an accession to your means, in executing your high commission, "Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," be refused, for the sake of conformity in matters recognised in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer as unessentials? Dare we pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth labourers into the harvest, while we reject all labourers but those of one peculiar type? The extension of orders to the class of men contemplated (with whatever safeguards, not infringing on evangelical freedom, which your wisdom might deem expedient), appears to your petitioners to be a subject supremely worthy of your deliberations.

In addition to the prospect of the immediate good which would thus be opened, an important step would be taken towards the effecting of a Church unity in the Protestant Christendom of our land. To become a central bond of union among Christians, who, though

differing in name, yet hold to the one Faith, the one Lord, and the one Baptism; and, who need only such a bond to be drawn together in closer and more primitive fellowship, is here believed to be the peculiar province and high privilege of your venerable body as a College of CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC BISHOPS *as such.*

This leads your petitioners to declare the ultimate design of their memorial; which is to submit the practicability, under your auspices, of some ecclesiastical system, broader and more comprehensive than that which you now administer, surrounding and including the Protestant Episcopal Church as it now is, leaving that Church untouched, identical with that Church in all its great principles, yet providing for as much freedom in opinion, discipline and worship, as is compatible with the essential faith and order of the Gospel. To define and act upon such a system, it is believed, must sooner or later be the work of an American Catholic Episcopate.

In justice to themselves, on this occasion, your memorialists beg leave to remark that, although aware that the foregoing views are not confined to their own small number, they have no reason to suppose that any other parties contemplate a public expression of them, like the present. Having therefore undertaken it, they trust that they have not laid themselves open to the charge of unwarranted intrusion. They find their warrant in the prayer now offered up by all our congregations, "that the comfortable Gospel of Christ

may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed, in all places, to the breaking down the kingdom of Sin, Satan, and Death." Convinced that, for the attainment of these blessed ends, there must be some greater concert of action among Protestant Christians, than any which yet exists, and believing that, with you, Right Reverend Fathers, it rests to take the first measures tending thereto, your petitioners could not do less than humbly submit their memorial to such consideration as in your wisdom you may see fit to give it. Praying that it may not be dismissed without reference to a Commission, and assuring you, Right Reverend Fathers, of our dutiful veneration and esteem,

We are, most respectfully,
Your Brethren and Servants in the Gospel of Christ,

W. A. MUHLENBERG,
C. F. CRUSE,
PHILIP BERRY,
EDWIN HARWOOD,
G. T. BEDELL,
HENRY GREGORY,
ALEX. H. VINTON,
M. A. DE WOLFE HOWE,
S. H. TURNER,
S. R. JOHNSON,
C. W. ANDREWS,
F. E. LAWRENCE,
and others.

NEW YORK, October 14th, 1853.

Concurring in the main purport of the above memorial, and believing that the necessities of the times call for some special efforts to promote unity among Christians, and to enlarge for that and other great ends the efficiency of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but not being able to adopt certain suggestions of the memorial, the undersigned most heartily join in the prayer that the subject may be referred to a Commission of your Venerable Body.

JOHN HENRY HOBART,
A. CLEVELAND COXE,
ED. Y. HIGBEE,
FRANCIS VINTON,
ISAAC G. HUBBARD,
and others.

Circular and Questions.

CIRCULAR AND QUESTIONS.

THE COMMISSION OF BISHOPS appointed at the late Meeting of the General Convention, to consider and report upon a Memorial of sundry Presbyters (the Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg and others), touching the "actual posture of our Church with reference to the great moral and social necessities of the day," and "presenting the inquiry whether the period has not arrived for the adoption of measures to meet these moral exigencies more comprehensive than any yet provided for by our present Ecclesiastical system," would state, that they have had the same under consideration at a meeting held at New York, commencing June 29th, 1854, and lasting several days.

The subject presented opens questions of the most momentous and comprehensive nature. It is the intention of the undersigned to bestow upon them patient and anxious consideration. That they may avail themselves of the aid and counsel of wise and good men in our own and other lands, and collect such

information as may conduce to a more thorough appreciation and satisfactory adjustment of the whole matter submitted to them, they request your particular attention to the Memorial which will be found on page 181 of the Journal of the last General Convention; and also to the following questions. Your answer to any or all of these questions in detail, and your views generally of the best means of enlarging the efficiency of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and also of promoting unity among Christians, will greatly oblige the undersigned; and they would respectfully request that it may be sent in at your earliest convenience.

The Commission stands adjourned to meet at Hartford, Conn., October 4th, 1854.

Communications may be addressed to the Secretary of the Commission, the Rev. Prof. JOHNSON, General Theological Seminary, New York.

Should your engagements render it impracticable to prepare your communication in season for the October meeting, it is expected that a further session will be held in Savannah early in February.

JAMES HERVEY OTEY, *Chairman.*
GEORGE W. DOANE,
ALONZO POTTER,
GEORGE BURGESS,
JOHN WILLIAMS,
JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT.

QUESTIONS.

I.

1. Can the present method of preparing young men for the ministry in the P. E. Church be improved, in respect to learning, piety, intellectual power or practical efficiency? If yea, please state how. Mention any remarkable facts respecting the training of ministers whom you have known to be specially useful and efficient.

2. Could any change be advantageously made in the prevalent character of our preaching? If yea, state what, and by what means. What modes of instruction, besides sermons from the pulpit, have you found specially beneficial and effective?

3. How can the influence of our ministry be made to reach the multitudes now living without the Gospel in our own land and neighbourhood, (a) by social intercourse, (b) by extra parochial services, (c) by philanthropic labours, &c., &c.?

4. Ought we, or ought we not, to have itinerating Evangelists, as well as settled Pastors; also permanent Deacons, and a portion of the clergy more especially devoted to theological and biblical studies?

5. Can any method for division of labour be suggested, by which persons of marked ability in a certain line shall have their useful gift specially exercised to the edification of the Church; and by which ministers thrown out of parish life may yet be advantageously occupied?

6. Is our present system of family, Sunday School, and catechetical instruction and training chargeable with any serious defects? If yea, please state them; suggest your opinion respecting the proper remedy.

7. Ought or ought not our parish churches in large towns to be opened more frequently on the Lord's day; and to different congregations at different hours?

8. What can be done for the religious instruction of boys when they leave the Sunday School?

9. Do the laymen and laywomen of our congregations co-operate sufficiently with the pastor in the work of winning souls? How can that co-operation be safely increased?

10. How can a spirit of true brotherly intercourse among our members be promoted?

11. Ought not young men to be seen in our churches in much larger number? Please to suggest means.

12. How can the proper influence of our Church over men engrossed in business be secured?

13. By what specific means can we increase adequately the pecuniary contributions of Churchmen to the work of evangelizing our own land, and the world at large? Do we instruct our people sufficiently on the dangers and responsibilities involved in the possession of property?

II.

1. Could changes be advantageously made in our Liturgical services?

(a.) By lengthening, shortening, or dividing?

(b.) By adapting the lessons, anthems, &c., better to the different ecclesiastical seasons?

(c.) By a larger number of special services and prayers for special occasions?

(d.) By a larger discretion in the use of hymns, and other sacred music?

(e.) By services specially fitted for missionary work at home or abroad?

(f.) By allowing the authorities of each Diocese larger liberty?

2. Should the conditions on which ministers are admitted to orders be prescribed exclusively by the General Convention?

3. Ought the conditions now imposed on candidates, who have been licensed or ordained in other Protestant communions, be relaxed?

(a.) As to term of time?

(b.) Degree of conformity to the worship, discipline, &c., of the P. E. Church?

4. Are any facts known to you indicating a preference, on the part of ministers of other Protestant bodies, for Episcopal ordination, if it were in their power?

5. Are any facts known to you indicating on the part of the members of such bodies, a disposition to make any sacrifices of sectarian feeling for the sake of restoring unity?

6. Are our Liturgical services, and the discretion accorded to our several Dioceses, as free as they were in the early church?

7. Ought the Church to make better provision for training teachers, nurses, &c. ?

8. Ought it to afford its female members who have leisure and inclination for benevolent labours, any more systematic means of pursuing them, than exist at present ?

Add any other matter which may occur to you. Where your engagements do not allow of a full consideration of all these questions, please select and answer such as seem to you most important.

As these inquiries can only be directed to a limited number of persons, it is desired that any others into whose hands they may fall, would freely offer any information which they may deem important to the Commission.

Report.

REPORT.

THE Commission of Bishops appointed by this House, at the meeting of the General Convention, in October, 1853, to take into consideration the memorial of the Rev. Wm. A. Muhlenberg, D. D., and sundry other Presbyters, a copy of which is hereunto appended, and the resolution of the Bishop of Pennsylvania, offered in the House of Bishops, on the 6th day of October, 1853, and referred on the 25th of the same month, a copy of which is also hereunto appended; having carefully considered the said memorial and resolution, beg leave to submit the following report.

The subjects referred to the Commission, present matters of the gravest and most interesting character, requiring patient examination and the most calm and dispassionate deliberation. So fully impressed were the members of the Commission with the importance and difficulty of the duty assigned to them, that on first assembling on the 29th day of June, 1854, in St. Peter's Church, New York, it was unanimously resolved that our meetings should be opened with

prayer, and the Divine wisdom and blessing invoked to guide us in our work. Every member was present at this meeting, and we trust we had an earnest of the Divine favour, in the hearty zeal with which all then entered upon the labour which had been laid upon us. We all never met together again. It pleased God, in his wise and inscrutable providence, to call from his earthly labours one of our members, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Wainwright, not very long after the adjournment of our first meeting, and the Commissioners were thus deprived of his very valuable counsel and zealous aid in their subsequent deliberations.

The Commission appointed the Rev. Professor Johnson, of the General Theological Seminary, their Secretary. Having been compelled, in the spring of 1855, to resign, he was replaced by Rev. Daniel Kendig, of Pennsylvania.

Sensible of the delicacy of their work, as well as of the intrinsic difficulties connected with the prosecution of it to any successful result, the Commissioners determined, in the first place, to avail themselves, as far as opportunity permitted, of the counsel and advice of wise and good men in our own and other lands. Information and suggestions were sought, not only from the members of our own communion, but likewise from those of reputation for piety and learning among other denominations of Christians.

With a view to these purposes, a series of questions was prepared, and, through the Bishops of our Church and other agencies, these questions, together with

printed copies of the Memorial, were widely distributed at home and abroad, and answers to them solicited. In this way, it was believed that we should ascertain the views of the Church at large upon the subjects submitted to consideration, gain valuable suggestions from the wise, learned and sober-minded of our own and other households of faith, be certified as to the real *animus* of the Church in reference to any proposed alterations, or contemplated modification, in our order of worship and discipline; and thus be prepared to submit to the General Convention such information as would enable it to act wisely and understandingly upon the whole subject. It was also hoped that plans might be suggested that would tend to mollify the asperities of religious differences, and heal some of the unhappy divisions which have long marred the fair form of Christianity in our world.

The reasonable expectations of the Commission, in reference to the readiness of our brethren to meet the calls made upon them, have not been disappointed. Upon all the subjects embraced in the Memorial, and presented in a more definite and detailed shape, by the series of questions addressed to clergymen and laymen, we have been favoured with numerous learned and well-digested communications, manifesting a profound interest in the work committed to us. At the same time, the various topics which have been mentioned, either by the memorialists or the Commission, have given rise to animated and earnest discussions in our religious journals, or have been made to assume a more

permanent character, in the form of pamphlets, claiming public attention. In this way, and by these means, ample opportunities have been given to all parties,—those who favour as well as those who oppose the movements of the memorialists,—to make themselves heard, and, as far as such instrumentalities can avail, to guard the Church against hasty or indeliberate legislation. In all these communications, it is gratifying to find the expression of a warm attachment to our order of worship.

Communications have also been received by members of the Commission from distinguished divines of other Protestant bodies. These have been marked, in some instances, by eminent ability, and in all cases by a generous interest in the subject under consideration, and a desire to see the Protestant Episcopal Church made, under God, an instrument of wider usefulness in evangelizing the neglected population of our own country, and in healing the strifes and divisions that afflict and dishonour Christendom.

It should not be passed here without notice and remark, that almost simultaneously, and certainly without any previous understanding or concert, a work similar to that committed to us, and having precisely the same aims and objects in view, was moved in our Mother Church of England. Can it be presumptuous to hope and trust that the same Lord, who is over all, and rich in the bestowal of his gifts of wisdom and grace on all who call upon Him faithfully, had put it into the hearts of his people on both sides of the

Atlantic at the same time, to devise and attempt a work having so high and holy purposes in view, as the edification and union of all Christian people, the enlargement of His Church, and the more rapid spread of His gospel over all the world? At the second meeting of the Commissioners, in 1854, their chairman was directed to open a correspondence with the Lord Bishop of Llandaff, chairman of the committee appointed to take charge of this work, collect information, and make report to Convocation. This was accordingly done, and a fraternal answer returned by his Lordship, giving assurance of the lively interest felt on the subject in England, and, at the same time, transmitting to us valuable documents, setting forth in detail what had been proposed in committee, and the action had thereon in Convocation.

The facts briefly adverted to, and many others not necessary to mention, have deeply impressed the Commission with a sense of the importance attached to the work which they have in charge. The spontaneousness of the movement, and the miscellaneous character of those who have manifested a lively concern in its progress, cannot be easily overlooked. Men, as widely remote from each other in their respective spheres of labour, as they are variant in their religious preferences, have alike given evidence of a conviction that the Church needed an enlargement of her means of usefulness. Laymen as well as clergymen, as different in their views of ecclesiastical polity as in their natural temperaments, have communicated their opin-

ions, and given expression to their hopes and fears, respecting our venerable forms of worship, around which so many hallowed and endearing associations cling. Dioceses, by their conventions, have taken the subject proposed for our consideration into serious deliberation, and have deemed an exposition of their views, with which they have, in several instances, favoured us, to be called for by the gravity of the interests involved in the issue. Such has been the course of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Kentucky, Louisiana, Florida, Tennessee, Illinois, and perhaps others.

These things, at least, attest that there is vitality in the Church. They show that her members are alive to the importance, not only of preserving her means of usefulness, but, if possible, of rendering those means more effective. This feeling originates in no pressure from without,—in no demands from a powerful body of non-conformists,—in no mandates from an imperious State authority,—but simply in the awakened zeal of our own people. It presents the spectacle of a Church, penetrated with an increasing sense of its responsibility to God and the world. And, since such a consciousness of Christian obligation springs from no human source, we may humbly hope that the Holy Ghost, who puts it into our hearts to inquire earnestly "Lord! what wilt thou have us to do?" may guide us in our counsels, and enable us to mature measures which shall not be without good fruit,

long after those who have devised and proposed them shall be numbered with the dead.

In considering the means and measures necessary for giving increased efficiency to the Church as the Divinely appointed instrument for reforming and saving mankind, we must never forget, that no organization will be of avail, without an animating, internal principle, imparting health, vigour and activity to the entire system, controlling and directing all its movements; while, on the other hand, an imperfect, or even a defective organization, invigorated by an active spiritual life, will exhibit energies and accomplish results in the moral transformation of human nature as marvellous as they are glorious. Still, as life is effectual to the accomplishment of useful ends, in proportion to the perfection of the organs through which it acts; as structure and adaptation are conditions of the greatest efficiency, so it behooves us, as "co-workers with God," in the recovery of this world from the dominion of sin and the Devil, not only to use the appointed weapons of our warfare, but to use them in the way best adapted to insure success. Our weapons may not be carnal, still they will not be found "mighty to the pulling down of strongholds," unless they be adapted to the objects to be effected. Wisdom and skill, combined with use and experience, are necessary to the successful employment of the most perfect instruments.

Our Liturgical services, be it remembered, were framed with a special view to the wants of a worship-

ping people. They were provided with a direct reference to organized parish Churches. They were intended to furnish two or more daily services to a population already won to the Church. But our actual mission is to many, in truth, to a large majority not yet conciliated to the Church, and, for the most part, strangers to her forms of worship. We have to seek those who have not been gathered into organized parishes,—who do not recognise in us any claim to spiritual oversight over them. We have to labour in places where very much of our work is outside of that contemplated in the plans of our offices, and in the prevalent methods of our preaching.

The Church was originally composed of converts gathered, by the labours of the Apostles, from the ranks of Judaism and Paganism. We have to deal with men who are generally not ignorant of our doctrines, but who are hardly more conversant with the system of worship to which we wish to conciliate them, than were the Jews and Gentiles, in the days of the Apostles, with the religion of our Saviour.

In seeking to modify or adapt our forms of worship to the actual wants and condition of a very large portion of our population, we do but act upon a principle distinctly recognised in our own and our Mother Church. In the preface to the Book of Common Prayer it is declared "that in every Church, whatever cannot be clearly determined to belong to doctrine may be referred to discipline; and therefore by common consent and authority may be altered, abridged,

enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions." It is also affirmed in the same preface, that the Church of England having made various reviews and changes—her aim hath been "to do that which according to her best understanding, might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church; the procuring of reverence, and the exciting of piety and devotion in the worship of God; and finally the cutting off occasion from them that seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against her Liturgy."

In no country in the world, perhaps, will there be found united under the same form of government, so great a variety of people and so much diversity in intellectual, moral, social, and religious character, as in this land. Immigration annually brings in its vast contribution to the elements of division in the religious sentiment and practice of our countrymen. There are found here men of all grades of intellectual development, from the most improved condition of mind, enlarged and elevated by the best advantages of education, to the grossest and most stupid ignorance growing out of poverty and absolute neglect. There are seen all complexions of social character diversified by the physical and moral differences which exist among the people of the old world, and which fix a lasting, if not an indelible impression upon the habits of human thought and action. In the population of the same State, and not unfrequently

in the same town, will be found all these varieties in national origin, in social, intellectual and religious character, at which we have barely glanced, and which present most serious obstacles, as painful experience most clearly proves, to the exercise of any wholesome and abiding influence on the part of the Gospel Ministry. Out of this anomalous condition of things arises the necessity of that diversity in our modes of operation which has not been, heretofore, sufficiently appreciated, and the need of that versatility of talents in the ministry, which in our case is more or less indispensable, and which is always found to be eminently useful.

It is not the purpose of this report to supply a treatise on the gifts of the ministry, or to direct specifically how they may be most usefully employed. This is not the time, nor does it fall within our province, to enter upon such a discussion. We can do no more, at present, than indicate, from an extended field of observation, and from the earnest representations made from every part of the Church, what seems to be most needed in order to the more vigorous prosecution of the great work with which we, in common with others, feel ourselves charged. That work looks almost exclusively to the inculcation of religious truth as the basis of a healthy moral sentiment securing national and individual prosperity, and as the foundation of that faith in God which leads to holiness of life, and the hope of salvation.

The sentiment of the Church is everywhere the

same, and emphatic in its expression as to the necessity of more force and directness in our preaching, and of more special adaptation to the varying circumstances of the Congregations which we are called to address. The habits of our people, moulded in a considerable degree by the nature of our civil and social institutions, and the constitution of the human mind, which impels us in most cases to prefer fervour to coldness, and that which is simple to that which is abstruse, are considerations which plainly indicate that our methods of dealing with men should be more direct and more manifold. They explain the reasons for that partiality with which extempore preaching is regarded—the superior influence which ministers accustomed so to preach possess in gathering together large congregations; and they account, in good part at least, for the numerical superiority of most denominations of Christians over the Protestant Episcopal Church in almost all the states, towns, and cities in the Union.

An examination into the relative increase of the various bodies of Christians in the United States within the last thirty years will exhibit some startling facts, which may well rouse us to serious considerations, and lead us to ask ourselves the questions, "what have we been doing? and what shall we do?" We have been in the habit of looking merely at the increase of our ministers and members within given periods as the proper exponent of our growth, without considering how that increase compares with the

rate of increase in the population at large. Making our estimate in this way, and it is the only accurate method to ascertain the ratio of our growth or increase as a Church, it will be found that we are by no means keeping pace with the population of the country in the provision we make for their religious instruction —to say nothing of our duty to heathen and foreign lands—that we are consequently falling very far below the measure of our responsibility, and that our growth in the last half century, which has been dwelt upon with complacency, if not with a spirit of vain glory, furnishes matter of deep humiliation and shame, rather than of boasting.

It is submitted to the serious and calm consideration of this House, whether with all the lights of past observation and experience before us, it be not wise to recommend to our ministers, as an important means of enhancing their usefulness and efficiency, the cultivation of a habit of extemporaneous address and of expository preaching, at least during one portion of the Lord's day. It is not designed to favour the idea of cultivating a habit of declamation or fervid exhortation at the expense of persevering and severe study. It is humbly conceived that previous and careful preparation is entirely consistent with the practice of extempore preaching, as here contemplated. With brief notes or heads of discourse, suggestive of topics and the preservation of a lucid arrangement, the fruits of much laborious research and reflection may be made available with their

utmost effect. We see no reason why a minister should not, in this way, present to the consideration of his congregation, the high and concerning truths of the gospel, and enforce them by its awful sanctions as effectively, as persuasively, and as convincingly as a lawyer states and argues his case from his brief at the bar. The plan suggested would have this further advantage. It would enable the preacher to avail himself of all suitable opportunities for proclaiming "the truth as it is in Jesus," which the diversities of time, place, and circumstances might present. He need not always wait till a congregation can be gathered in some fixed place of worship furnished with the conveniences of lectern and pulpit, but after apostolic example, let him preach, if it be expedient, in an upper chamber, or in the market place, by the sea shore, or in the courts of the prison, by night or day, in storm and tempest, or in the sunshine of bright and cloudless skies. Everywhere in season and out of season he is to exercise his vocation, as need may require, and, like a beacon on the stormy ocean of life, point the voyager to the way of safety and the haven of rest. He need not be bound by any rules or restrictions which custom may have established as to the length of his discourses. This should vary with emergencies, and especially with the state of those who hear. His quick and discerning glance will easily detect any restlessness or listlessness on the part of his hearers, and furnish him the best chronometer to graduate his sermons. Thus too he

will be enabled to suit his subject to the character of his congregation; and bringing out of his treasures —the accumulated stores of reading and study—of observation and reflection—things both new and old; he may use a written discourse, or speak from notes; he may furnish food for the thoughtful mind, by unfolding some great doctrine of Christianity, or, by animating exhortation, rouse the desponding to renewed exertion for the prize of eternal life; he may enforce the high and commanding morality of the Gospel, or he may attract, edify, and charm, by portraying the example of Christ, doing good to the souls and bodies of men, and may exhort them to its imitation. In a word, the vast range of the Gospel takes in all the interests of man as a rational and accountable creature, it comprehends all his relations to God and his fellow men, it embraces all his hopes for time and eternity, and from them all, the preacher may choose his theme, and from the boundless field of nature, in the rich exuberance of her productions —the endless variety of objects which garnish the heavens above, or beautify the earth beneath, or replenish the waters under the earth—he may draw from them all, illustrations to enforce and adorn his subject.

These remarks point to the expediency, not to say necessity, of a corresponding variety, to some extent, in our Liturgical services. It is the general voice of our communion, that in adjusting the length of our public services, more regard should be had to the

physical ability of both minister and people; and this is especially important in those parts of our country where the heats of summer are long-continued and debilitating, rendering mental exertion burdensome, and even perilous to health. More attention also seems to be demanded to the degree of Liturgical culture among the people, and a more economical use of our clerical force. By the arrangements which the Commission would recommend, it is believed that, in most of our established congregations, three services may be had on Sunday, and several during the week, without overburdening the strength and ability of the minister.

We read that, in the primitive Church, "gifts" were bestowed by our blessed Lord upon his members, "differing according to the measure of grace given unto them." These gifts were intended to supply everything that was needful for carrying on the work our Lord had appointed to his Church. However they manifested their influence by "diversities of operations and differences of administrations" in the work of apostles, or prophets, or evangelists, or pastors, or teachers, they were all given "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." But, that such varieties of gifts were bestowed "for the edifying of the Church," seems, in a great measure, to be overlooked or forgotten. It would appear that all ministers are now expected to be priests, whether they have "the gift of ministering" or not; all to be rectors of

parishes, whether they have the gift of ruling or not; all to be teachers, whether they show aptitude for instruction or not; and, very many ("who name the name of Christ,") seem to have reached the conclusion that there is no such gift as that mentioned by the Apostle, when he enjoins it as a duty to give "with simplicity." The consequences of this ignorance or forgetfulness have been exhibited in the history of the Church, even within the memory of some now living, with startling effect and melancholy frequency. Ministers are found who yet do not minister; rectors who cannot govern; pastors who do not feed the flock; teachers send forth theological essays, for the instruction of the Church, who might find better employment in studying the Bible and Catechism, while the necessary means for maintaining religious services too often have to be wrung from those who appear reluctant to recognise it as a Christian obligation to give of their ability, as God has prospered them, with liberality, with cheerfulness, and with simplicity. On every side the complaint is heard, that the work of the Church languishes, or is not done. That we have refused or neglected to use many gifts which Christ has bestowed on his Church, is apparent from our not providing employment for those members of the body which are fitted for special duties. We see, for example, persons who have a fondness or peculiar aptitude for searching out the poor and helpless. No cellars are too low and dark, no garrets too high and comfortless, to deter them in their efforts to find and

relieve the hunger-bitten children of poverty. Vice and filth do not offend them, but excite their compassion and their tears. Degradation and infamy do not repel them, but inspire their charity, and give fervency to their prayers.

There are those, on the other hand, who have no inclination to engage in this humble and merciful work, or whose qualities of mind and body unfit them for such employments. They may not have the tact, wisdom, or other resources necessary to guide them in the selection of means adequate to insure success to such schemes of benevolence. Still they wish to do good, and the minister of a parish, if he be prudent and judicious, will find them employment. Some of them may be used in reading prayers and the Holy Scriptures to people, whose situation or opportunities do not allow them to attend the regular and stated services of the sanctuary. In the almost infinite variety of conditions in which our population is now found, there can be no lack of opportunity for the employment of every talent which the Church can command.

Again, there are men whose temperaments incline them to be constantly moving from place to place. Connected with this constitutional peculiarity, there is generally a frankness and cordiality of manner which renders such persons favourites wherever they go. They may not possess any great breadth or variety of learning; nor any great powers of thought; but, they have a faculty of correct and close observation, a

knowledge of men, as individuals and in masses, and perhaps extraordinary skill and tact in controlling them.

Again, we see men who have that peculiar power or gift which is necessary for organizing and ruling bodies of men; who seem by intuition to know just when this quality is to be stimulated, and that to be laid under restraint; when this particular trait can be neutralized by the development of another; when it is proper to rebuke one, and when to encourage another. They have a ready perception of the thought that will touch the common sense of mankind, and harmonize the mass. It is impossible to describe all the qualities which go to make up the character of such men: we perceive them when we say that such men were born to be rulers.

In this class will be found those best calculated of all, perhaps, in the Church to fill the office of Evangelists. Men, whose chief, if not their sole employment, it shall be to preach the Gospel in remote and morally destitute parts of the country, or in the neglected districts of our large cities, where the Pastors of established congregations never come, and the preachers at missionary stations but rarely. Men who shall be under the special direction of the Bishop of the Diocese, labouring where he shall appoint, distributing books and tracts where opportunity shall serve, and reporting to the Bishop as often as he shall require.

Such a corps of active labourers seems almost

indispensable to the complete organization of the Church according to the primitive model, and unquestionably necessary to its extension in our land. It may be supposed, and the idea has been sometimes advanced, that the Bishops can and ought to do all the work contemplated by the creation of this class of preachers. With dioceses of the present extent it is, in most cases, simply impossible. Many of our Bishops spend much the greater portion of their time in travelling and preaching. Almost the only increase made to the Church in many parts of the country, is attributable to the labours of the Episcopate. But observation and experience have demonstrated that the utmost exertions of the Bishops cannot meet the growing demands of our population.

And here we are constrained to call attention to the wasted energy and unemployed power of the women of the Church. The Sisters of Charity in the Romish communion are worth, perhaps, more to their cause than the combined wealth of their Hierarchy—the learning of their priesthood, and the self-sacrificing zeal of their missionaries. The providential government of the world leaves everywhere a large number of unmarried and unemployed females, and thus appears to point the Church to a wise appropriation of their peculiar talents or gifts, in the cause of Christ and of humanity. The associated charity and benevolence of Christian sisterhoods which we have in mind, is the very opposite of the hermitage and the nunnery. Instead of a criminal and cowardly

withdrawal from the world, and the duties which the wants and distresses of humanity may claim, it is the voluntary consecration to Christ of all the powers of body and soul in the active performance of the most tender, the most endearing, and yet the most neglected offices of charity. Many have seen, and many lament our loss in this respect; but individual zeal and effort can effect but little in the way of providing a remedy. The constituted authorities of the Church must take hold of the subject—deal with it without reserve—combine effort in the cause, and give direction to it without the fear of man.

With such instrumentalities as are now in use, the Commission is constrained to report further, that in their judgment the debt of the ministry and members of the Church to the young is not sufficiently felt and adequately discharged. In families acknowledging the obligations of a Christian profession, there is too little positive and regular religious instruction, and too little of pious, paternal training, or discipline. By Pastors there is want of attention to catechizing—to the Sunday School—and to such preaching and services are best calculated to reach, impress, and influence those who have arrived at the period of juvenescence.

It is also very certain that the full effect of our ministrations cannot be obtained, and the reasonable expectations of the Church at large be met and fulfilled in this behalf, until our candidates for orders, and our ministers, be trained to more robust intellec-

tual habits, by a more thorough and severe mental discipline: and to this very necessary preparation must be added a clear apprehension of the moral wants of the times, and the precise intellectual wants of the people. Next to this, and hardly of less importance, there is need of more practical common sense, in dealing with men upon the subjects of religion, and recommending it to their attention. In this country almost every man and woman feels competent to discuss questions of theology, and give instruction on the doctrines of the Gospel. These pretensions have to be met by the ministry, and to be met in a spirit of meekness and of deep compassion for the erring and deceived. Hence we have found, in very many of the communications made to us by clergymen and laymen, the opinion, or rather the conviction very earnestly expressed, that in preparing candidates for the work of the ministry, more attention should be paid to practical training for its duties—that there should be also more cultivation of the powers of thought, and taste for investigation—more rhetorical culture—more rigid and searching examinations, and better established habits of systematic study after ordination.

But among the many wants of the Church in order to her energetic and effective influence—that fulness and completeness which we desire for her—few perhaps are more obvious, and none more generally deplored, than the want of an impressive and devotional manner of reading the Liturgy. This is a

great and crying evil, and to its existence is to be attributed, no doubt, much of the complaint which is urged against the length and formality of our services. The evil is the more inexcusable and intolerable, for the simple reason that it might be remedied, in a vast majority of cases, by due care and persevering efforts on the part of those whose bounden duty it is, and pleasure it ought to be, to qualify themselves for the becoming and decent performance of this, the most sacred part of their holy functions. He who leads the devotions of a congregation, in their approaches to the mercy-seat, with the offerings of praise and prayer to the Divine Majesty, can make no acceptable apology to his people, and no excuse to his own conscience, for carelessness and irreverence. An experienced clergyman, in a communication to the Commission, complains of this evil as very prevalent, and proposes the following remedy:

"Let all candidates be taught to read English. The only certain method of correcting vicious modes of reading is, to employ the services of some one who can give to the student an *accurate rehearsal* of his own performances. After many repetitions of this discipline, the young man will begin to detect the similar vice in his own tones, and then only will it be possible for him to correct it."

In this connexion we cannot but allude to the important duty devolving on the members of our congregations, to take their part earnestly and effectively in our public services. Were this done in the re-

sponses, in the chants, in the metrical Psalmody—done in the way which the Church, in her wisdom, has prescribed, and with a hearty observance of her decent rules and usages—much of the complaint now made of the wearisome length of the services, would be hushed. What is not done as it should be, is usually wearisome. It is a duty imperative on the clergy, to see to it that any failure in this important matter shall not be justly chargeable to the want of proper instruction and urgency on their part.

The Commission is of opinion that every minister having parochial charge, should be diligent in the use of means for interesting and retaining under wholesome religious influence boys and young men.

1st. By giving them employment in the Church and the Sunday School.

2d. By frequently meeting with them, and manifesting interest in their welfare.

3d. By directing their choice in reading, recommending proper books, &c.

4th. By cultivating among them a love for Sacred music.

It is deemed of vital importance that the ministry should, with every class, but particularly with the young, insist earnestly upon their responsibility as stewards of the grace of the Gospel,—employing them as helpers to the ministry, not only in the Sunday School and Bible Classes, but, when found apt and prudent, in district visiting,—in Lay-reading and catechizing in destitute places, on the principle that they

are bound to labor, as well as to give of their substance, for the promotion and increase of true religion; that they cannot be faithful to God, unless they improve the talents committed to them; and that they must begin this work when young, if they would be efficient in manhood, and happy when old.

And here we are reminded of one of the most mournful of our deficiencies, and which ought to move us all to deep humiliation, and earnest prayer. We refer to the small number of our clergy, compared with our existing wants, and the inadequate provision made for their support. Few are found pressing towards that which ought to be regarded as the happiest, the most useful, and the most honourable of human pursuits; and of those who engage in it, few receive more than a meagre recompense for their services. Does not this indicate, on the part of young men, a sad want of zeal and devotion in the cause of Christ, and on their part also, who, as parents, pastors, and friends, ought to move the young to aspire to this holy office? And, does it not show, on the part of Christians, whom God has made the stewards of his bounty, a deplorable insensibility to their duty and their privilege, when they suffer ministers and missionaries to languish in want, while they pay without stint for the services of men of all other professions and occupations in life? For this sore evil, it becomes us to seek earnestly a proper remedy. A more abundant measure of God's grace is doubtless the first and most important requisite, and for this the Church

should call upon her children to pray importunately and continually. But it cannot be denied that, were more careful and general consideration given to the subject, means would be devised to elicit much more ample gifts from the Laity, and to draw to the ranks of the Clergy many an earnest spirit now destined to other callings. Almsgiving and other acts of Christian beneficence require to be cultivated, as habits; and no pastor should be satisfied unless his methods of proceeding are sufficiently varied and steady to enlist the interest, and engage the active and continued co-operation of all his people. Most congregations need, on this subject, it is feared, more instruction than they receive, and this instruction needs to be followed by more active superintendence from the clergyman, and more extended sympathy and aid from individuals of the congregation.

The Commission have also taken counsel with each other, and earnestly sought to devise some plan which might contribute to heal the divisions which so unhappily distract the Christian world. We cannot but rejoice in the interest which the members of our own household of faith have manifested, in common with all good men of other denominations of Christians upon this subject; and we doubt not that all will rejoice, if measures can be taken to restore the unity of the Church, and promote, by God's blessing, an increase of charity among all "who name the name of Christ." We must all, however, be well aware that the first step towards this happy and greatly

desired result, must be sought in unity of spirit, rather than unity of doctrine and discipline; and, therefore, mutual allowances, and a large toleration are indispensable requisites, for which we should fervently and devoutly pray. The action which the Commission recommends upon this subject will be stated in the form of a resolution, and of a prayer, at the conclusion of this report.

We cannot but earnestly and affectionately recommend to our brethren and friends everywhere, in view of the momentous interests involved in the final disposition of this question, to strive to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

1st. By doing justice to the merits of other systems as readily as they expose their demerits.

2dly. By repressing a spirit of self-complacency and self-laudation.

3dly. By infusing into our worship, preaching, and general policy, more of the ancient and historical element on one side, and of the popular and practical on the other.

4thly. By a more cordial manner towards ministers of other religious bodies, who are inquiring into the claims of our communion.

5thly. By considering whether we cannot safely lessen canonical impediments in the way of ministers, licentiates, and others desirous of our orders, with sufficient guarantees for soundness in doctrine, discipline, and worship.

6thly. By fruitfulness in all good works. If our

ministers were more fervid, self-denying, and laborious; our people more charitable, exemplary, and devout; if, in a word, we were all that we ought to be, and might be, from the alleged superiority of our gifts and privileges, the attraction to the Church would be universal and irresistible.

In conclusion, the Commission place before the House the positive results which they have reached. In a large proportion, indeed, it may be said that (with a few exceptions), in all of the communications made to us by members of our Church, the opinion has been expressed that the Morning service might sometimes be shortened with advantage, and that greater variety ought to obtain in services which are beside the regular offices of Morning and Evening Prayer in established congregations. These are ends to which the efforts of many in the Anglican Church are now anxiously directed. Earnest expression has also been given to the wish, in many quarters, that the calendar of lessons should be revised, that additional hymns, anthems, and canticles should be provided, with other emendations, which would affect no doctrine of the Church, and might materially aid in the edification of her people. It has been the purpose of the Commission, however, so far as their present labours go, to leave the Prayer Book untouched: they have also doubted how far the consideration of such proposed alterations would fall within the duty assigned to them; and, at all events, they felt that, if any alterations of the Prayer Book were proposed, the

House of Deputies would be entitled to take part in the preliminary discussions connected with them, and that much more time ought to be devoted to the work than they have been able to command. They have concluded, therefore, to commend this subject to the General Convention, to be disposed of as in its wisdom it may judge to be most expedient. They have many valuable papers, embodying the results of much labour and learning, and of a very extended experience, which will be at the service of a committee, should the Convention decide to appoint one.

After much reflection, the Commission have come to the unanimous conclusion that some of the most material of the improvements which are loudly called for, and which commend themselves to our own judgment, might be attained without legislation. There is nothing in the Rubrics or Canons which requires that, when the Holy Communion is administered, it should be preceded, immediately or otherwise, by the office for daily Prayer. The practice rests merely on usage, and there are occasions when, for want of physical ability on the part of the minister, or from the very large number of persons communicating, or for other reasons, it would be right that the liberty, which the law does not withhold, of omitting the Daily Prayer should be exercised. To secure this, nothing more would be needed, it is thought, than a declarative resolution of this House. The same discretion seems allowable, in respect to the time of using the Litany, and the Ante-Communion Office. Canon XLVII.,

of 1832, already provides for special services, to be set forth by Bishops in their own Dioceses; and the Commission have concluded that, by exercising the power thus given, provision could be made for those local necessities which result from peculiarities in the character of the population, or in the circumstances under which the Church is to be extended.

They, therefore, recommend unanimously that the following *preamble and resolutions* be adopted by the House of Bishops.

Whereas, the order of worship, as prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, or as settled by usage, has been framed with special reference to established parish churches, and to a population already incorporated with the Church:

And *whereas*, our actual work is, or should be, among many not yet connected with our congregations, or where there are no established parishes, or where said parishes are yet in their infancy:

And *whereas*, there are, or may be, in different dioceses, peculiar emergencies arising out of the character or condition of certain portions of the population, which demand some special services:

And *whereas*, it is desirable that the use of the Book of Common Prayer, as the vehicle of the Church's devotions, should be such as to cultivate an enlightened love for the Liturgy, and enable the clergy and people to make their labours for Christ most effective: therefore, *Resolved*, as the sense of the House of Bishops,

I. That ministers may, at their discretion, use separately the office for Morning Prayer; and that, where a third service is to be held, the Litany, or the Ante-Communion office, or both, may be used in the afternoon: the order for Evening Prayer being reserved for said third service.

II. That the order for the Holy Communion, in its entireness, may, with a sermon, be used separately; provided, nevertheless, that, on the greater Festivals, it should, in their judgment, be preceded by the office of Morning or Evening Prayer.

III. That, on occasions or services other than regular Morning and Evening Prayer, in established congregations, ministers may, at their discretion, use such parts of the Book of Common Prayer, and such Lessons, as shall, in their judgment, tend most to edification.

IV. That the Bishops of the several Dioceses may provide such special services as, in their judgment, shall be required by the peculiar spiritual necessities of any class or portion of the population within said Dioceses.

V. That, to indicate the desire of this Church to promote union amongst Christians, and as an organ of communication with different Christian bodies or individuals, who may desire information or conference on the subject, it is expedient that five Bishops be appointed by ballot, at each General Convention, as Commissioners for the foregoing purpose, to be entitled the Commission on Church Unity. They also recom-

mend that Canon XLV. (1832) be so amended that the concluding sentence may read as follows: "And, in performing said service, no other Prayers, Lessons, Anthems, or Hymns shall be used than those prescribed by the said book, unless with the consent of the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese."

The effect of this amendment would be to enable particular dioceses under the direction of the ecclesiastical authority of the same, during such seasons as Passion Week, Christmas, and the like, to substitute Lessons, Anthems, or Canticles more appropriate to the occasion, and also to bring the provisions of this Canon into harmony with those of Canon XLVII. (1832).

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies having requested [see Journal, p. 73] this House in 1853 to consider the propriety of setting forth a form of prayer for the increase of the Holy Ministry, according to the command of Christ, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that He would send forth labourers into his harvest," and a resolution to the same effect of the Bishop of Pennsylvania in this House having been referred to the Commission, and several propositions having been made for the adoption of other occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings, the Commission have thought that it might be proper to offer for consideration the following forms:—

1. A Prayer for Unity.
2. A Prayer for the Increase of the Ministry.
3. A Prayer for Missions and Missionaries.

4. A Prayer for the Young, to be used on occasions of Catechising and the like.

5. A Prayer for a Person about to be exposed to special danger.

6. A Prayer in time of public calamities, dangers, or difficulties.

7. A Thanksgiving for deliverance of a person from any peril.

8. A Prayer for deliverance from public calamities and dangers.

9. A Thanksgiving for the recovery of a sick child.

A PRAYER FOR UNITY.

O God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace, give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatever else may hinder us from godly union and concord: that, as there is but one body, and one Spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all; so we may henceforth be all of one heart and one soul, united in the holy bond of truth, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify thee: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A PRAYER FOR THE INCREASE OF THE MINISTRY.

O Almighty God, who hast in thy holy church committed to the hands of men the ministry of reconciliation, to gather together a great flock in all parts of

the world, to the eternal praise of thy holy name; we humbly beseech thee that thou wilt put it into the hearts of many faithful men to seek this sacred ministry, appointed for the salvation of mankind; that so thy church may rejoice in a due supply of true and faithful pastors, and the bounds of thy blessed kingdom may be enlarged: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A PRAYER FOR MISSIONS AND MISSIONARIES.

O Lord, who didst come to seek and to save the lost, and to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth, hear, we beseech thee, the prayers of thy church for those who, at thy command, go forth to preach the gospel to every creature. Preserve them from all dangers to which they may be exposed; from perils by land and perils by water; from the deadly pestilence; from the violence of the persecutor; from doubt and impatience; from discouragement and discord; and from all the devices of the powers of darkness. And while they plant and water, send thou, O Lord, the increase; gather in the multitude of the heathen; convert, in Christian lands, such as neglect so great salvation; so that thy name may be glorified, and thy kingdom come, O gracious Saviour of the world, to whom, with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, be honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

A PRAYER FOR THE YOUNG AT CATECHISINGS OR IN SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

Almighty Father, who hast promised that they who

seek early thy heavenly wisdom, shall early find it, and find it more precious than all the treasures of this world, send down on these thy children the grace and blessing of thy Holy Spirit; that they, being trained up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, may choose and love thy way, and depart from it no more for ever; and that, when thou makest up thy jewels in thy glorious kingdom, these children may be there, and may be thine; all of which we ask for the sake of thy holy child Jesus, our only Saviour and Redeemer. Amen.

A PRAYER FOR A PERSON EXPOSED TO ANY SPECIAL PERIL.

Almighty God, the Saviour of all men, we humbly commend to thy tender care and sure protection in *his* danger, thy *servant* for whom our prayers are desired. Let thy fatherly hand, we beseech thee, be over *him;* let thy holy angels have charge of *him;* with thy loving-kindness defend *him*, as with a shield: and either bring *him* out of *his* peril in safety, with a heart to show forth thy praises for ever, or else sustain *him* with that glorious hope by which alone thy servants can have victory in suffering and in death, through the sole merits of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A PRAYER IN TIME OF PUBLIC CALAMITIES, DANGERS, OR DIFFICULTIES.

O most mighty God! . . King of kings, and Lord of lords, without whose care the watchman waketh but in vain, we implore, in this our time of need, thy

succour and blessing in behalf of our rulers and magistrates, and of all the people of this land (*or*, of this commonwealth, *or*, of this community). Remember not our many and great transgressions; turn from us the judgments which we feel (*or*, fear); and give us wisdom to discern, and courage to attempt, and faithfulness to do, and patience to endure, whatsoever shall be well-pleasing in thy sight; that so thy chastenings may yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness, and that at the last we may rejoice in thy salvation, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A THANKSGIVING FOR A PERSON DELIVERED FROM ANY PERIL.

O God, most mighty and most gracious, by whom the hairs of our heads are all numbered, we give thee hearty thanks that thou hast delivered from *his* great peril thy servant, who now desireth that the thanksgiving of many on *his* behalf may redound to thy glory. Write on *his* mind the perpetual remembrance of thy preserving mercy; save *him* from the hardness of an ungrateful heart, and grant that all *his* future days, and all that thou hast graciously continued to *him*, may be consecrated to thee and to thy blessed service, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A THANKSGIVING FOR DELIVERANCE FROM PUBLIC CALAMITIES.

O eternal God, the shield of our help, beneath whose sovereign defence thy people dwell in safety, we bless and praise, we laud and magnify thy glorious

name for all thy goodness to the people of this land (*or*, of this commonwealth, *or*, of this community), and especially for our merciful deliverance from those calamities which of late we suffered (*or*, dreaded). Inspire our souls with grateful love; lift up our voices in songs of thankfulness; and so pour out upon us thy Holy Spirit, that we may be humble and watchful in our prosperity, patient and steadfast in our afflictions, and always enjoy the blessed confidence of that people whose God is the Lord; all which we ask through Jesus Christ, our Mediator and Redeemer, to whom, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, praise and dominion, now and for ever. Amen.

A THANKSGIVING FOR THE RECOVERY OF A SICK CHILD.

Almighty Father, who, at the prayers of thy servants, Elijah and Elisha, didst gladden the hearts of two pious mothers by restoring them their dead, and who, by thy Son Jesus Christ, didst raise to health and life the children of many sorrowing parents, accept, we beseech thee, the thanks of thy *servants* who *call* upon us to join our praises with their own for the deliverance of their dear child from sickness and the grave. May that recovered child be ever thine; and may the hearts of all to whom *he* is precious, so burn at the remembrance of thy goodness, that they may hold no thank-offering too costly to show forth thy praise, and may present themselves, a

living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto thee, through the merits of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Commission in making this report have endeavoured to call attention to the subjects which are believed to have been in the contemplation of the memorialists, and to be of chief interest to the members of the Church. They have by no means attempted to embrace all the matters which have been suggested or proposed as amendments to our order of worship and system of discipline and religious instruction and training. As far as consistent with a proper understanding of the views of the Commission, brevity has been consulted in their report. With a view to gain whatever advantage might be derived from a division of labour, and from concentrating the thoughts of individuals on particular subjects, the chairman, last spring, assigned to each member of the Commission special topics for consideration, and requested his views upon them. The communications made in consequence will be found in an Appendix, and it is hoped that they may be advantageously considered by the members of our communion.

The Commission cannot close this report without recording their sense of indebtedness to those who have favoured them with communications respecting the interesting work in which they have been engaged: and they now commit the result of their labours to the disposal of this House, with the prayer to the

God of all wisdom and grace, to overrule its deliberations to the promotion of His own glory and the good of His Church.

JA. H. OTEY, *Chairman.*
G. W. DOANE,
ALONZO POTTER,
GEORGE BURGESS,
JNO. WILLIAMS.

Contributions.

BISHOP DOANE'S CONTRIBUTION.

THE BISHOP OF NEW JERSEY'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE REPORT ON THE QUESTIONS ASSIGNED TO HIM BY THE CHAIRMAN, THE BISHOP OF TENNESSEE.

I. 1. *Can the present method of preparing young men for the Ministry in the Protestant Episcopal Church be improved, in respect to learning, piety, intellectual power, or practical efficiency? If yea, please state how. Mention any remarkable facts respecting the training of ministers whom you have known to be specially useful and efficient.*

I. 6. *Is our present system of family, Sunday School, and catechetical instruction and training chargeable with any serious defects? If yea, please state them; suggest your opinions respecting the proper remedy.*

I. 8. *What can be done for the religious instruction of boys when they leave the Sunday School?*

II. 8. *Ought the Church to make better provision for training teachers, nurses, &c.?*

THE points, presented in these questions, arranged, in their natural order, seem to be the following—

i. Family Training:

ii. Pastoral Instruction:

1. In the Church;
2. In the Sunday School;
3. In the Parish School.

iii. The further religious instruction of boys, after the school age.

iv. Preparation for the Ministry; as to learning, piety, intellectual power, and practical efficiency.

v. Provision for training helps to the Ministry:

1. Teachers;
2. Nurses.

A wide and noble field! The widest and the noblest! How far beyond all mortal comprehension! How high above all human skill! Happily, we are not so left. The field is humanity: lost humanity; humanity redeemed; humanity to be renewed, that it may be saved. What is it, but "the height of that great argument," which brought the Son of God, into the world? What is it, but the Message of the Gospel? What is it, but the Mission of the Church? The just disposition of these subjects seems to me to underlie the whole Memorial; and, in their actual working, to meet all its reasonable demands. In their treatment, we are referred to Holy Scripture, for our principles: and, for their execution, to the action of the Church; as it has been, as it is, and as

it is capable of being, within the limits of its Divine organization, and the provisions for their practical application. Five words meet all the case: THE GOSPEL, IN THE CHURCH.

i. Of God's will, on the subject of *Family Training*, His holy Word leaves us in no doubt. When He declared, that Abraham should "surely become a great and mighty nation, and," that "all the nations of the earth" should "be blessed, in him," He says, expressly, as His ground of confidence, "For, I know him, that he will command his children and his household, after him; and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment: that the Lord may bring, upon Abraham, that which he hath spoken of him."* The word of God, by Moses, is express and peremptory. "Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee, this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them, when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."† The Royal Psalmist had no other hope, for truth and duty, in his time. "Hear my law, O my people; incline your ears unto the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in a parable; I will declare hard sentences of old: which

* Genesis xviii. 18, 19.

† Deuteronomy vi. 4–7.

we have heard, and known, and, such, as our fathers have told us: that we should not hide them, from the children of the generations, to come; but, to show the honour of the Lord, His mighty and wonderful works, that He hath done. He made a covenant with Jacob, and gave Israel a law, which He commanded our forefathers to teach their children; that their posterity might know it, and the children which were yet unborn; to the intent, that, when they came up, they might show their children the same."* And, the Apostle to the Ephesians sums all up, in fewest words, when he enjoins, on Christian parents, as their highest duty, to their children, to "bring them up, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."†

What God thus clearly wills, the Church as faithfully adopts. Requiring, that all infants be baptized; urging that their baptism be not deferred "longer than the first or second Sunday, next after their birth, or other Holy Day, falling between, unless upon a great and reasonable cause;" and, warning them, "that, without like great cause and necessity, they procure not their children to be baptized at home, in their houses," she exhorts the Godfathers and Godmothers, and with, and through, them, the parents, in each case, to see "that this infant be taught, so soon as he shall be able to learn, what a solemn vow, promise, and profession, he hath" "made by" them. "And, that he may know these things the better," they are to

* Ps. lxxviii. 1–7, Prayer Book version. † Eph. vi. 4.

"call upon him to hear sermons, and, chiefly," they are to "provide that he may learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health; and that this child may be virtuously brought up, to lead a godly and a Christian life; remembering, always, that Baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is, to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto Him, that, as He died and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living." In the rubric of the Catechism, she requires that "all Fathers, Mothers, Masters, and Mistresses shall cause their Children, Servants, and Apprentices, who have not learned their Catechism, to come to the Church, at the time appointed, and obediently to hear, and be ordered by the Minister, until such time as they have learned all that is here appointed for them to learn." And she accumulates the obligation of this duty, to the very highest point, in prescribing, that the Catechism shall "be learned, by every person, before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop;" and that "there shall be none admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed."

Can a system of Family Training more effectual be imagined? More complete in itself? More positive

in its obligations? What can it need, but to be faithfully enforced? The Church Catechism is the most wonderful Manual, for the religious nurture of children, that ever has been produced. It is perfectly scriptural. It is simple, to the level of the lowest. It has ranges, which the highest cannot reach. Every word of it is instructive. It may be divided into a hundred lessons: and every one of them will be suggestive of a hundred others. Only, let parents take it in hand. Let them study it. Let them compare it, word by word, with Holy Scripture. Let them pray over it. Let them teach it to their children, "Line upon line, line upon line; precept upon precept, precept upon precept; here a little and there a little." It will grow upon their hands. It will engage their own hearts; and, through them, the hearts of their children. No childhood will exhaust its lessons. And, generation after generation, as they grow up, at their knees, will but develop it more fully, in the elder minds and hearts; and impress it more deeply on the youngest, that come after them.

"Dim, or unheard, the words may fall:
And, yet, the heaven-taught mind
May learn the sacred air; and all
The harmony unwind." * * *

"And, if some tones be false or low,
What are all prayers beneath,
But cries of babes, that cannot know
Half the deep thoughts, they breathe?"

But, parents must be willing to take time. If they can count it such, they must be willing to take trouble. They must think what a soul is. They must think what a fallen soul is. They must think what it cost to save a soul. They must think what it is to mould a soul. They must think what it is to be crowned with souls, in Heaven. They must interest the hearts of their children, in the Catechism, by their own interest, in it. They must talk to them of it, every day. They must illustrate it, by the incidents and anecdotes of common life. They must show how it applies to daily duties, and to daily difficulties. And, they must make a lesson in it the delightful duty, and the dutiful delight, of the most holy day. If any think this is too much, what business have they to have children? If any will not do so much, whose fault is it but theirs that they have naughty children; who plague them, all their lives: and, after all, are lost?

And, where, meanwhile, are the Godfathers and Godmothers, which every baptism is required to have? Why should not their assistance be invoked? Why should not their influence come in aid of the parental? What a lesson, to a child, of the value of his soul, that it has five trustees, for its safe keeping! What a guarantee of interest, here, and immortality, hereafter, if every child could see, and feel, that they were all enlisted, for him; in their teaching, in their conduct, and in their prayers: "by word, and deed, and good example!" Shall we not use this system faithfully, before we doubt its efficiency? Shall we not

try it thoroughly, before we ask a better? To speak of the time it will take, of the trouble it will give, of the interference it will be with business or society, is to confess the truth: that our hearts are not in it; that we are not true to our children; that we expect a system to do, what *we* will not. But, no system will. And so our wisdom and our happiness lie, with our duty, in using what we have, with faithfulness; and asking God to bless us, and our children, in its use.

ii. We pass from Family Training to *Pastoral Instruction.* The Lover of our souls, who died for them, loved them too well, to leave them, even to fathers and to mothers, to be saved. When He said, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not; for of such is the Kingdom of God," He covered their whole case, from the moment of their birth. And, when He made the highest test of Simon Peter's love for Him, to feed His lambs, He committed all His children to His pastors; and He made the highest trust of all His pastors, the nurture of His children.

1. The Pastoral Instruction of children should be first, and chiefly, in the Church. They come there, first, in Holy Baptism, to be made God's children. Not, as a ceremony. Not, as an incident. But, as a necessity of their nature: that they may be "born again;" and so made "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven." Upon no point, is it more important, that the Pastoral Instruction should be clear, and full, and faithful. That parents may not only understand "the great

necessity of this sacrament, where it may be had," and "the great benefit" their children "reap thereby:" but, may know, and do, their duty, in carrying out a beginning, so auspicious, through all its states and stages, to its glorious and immortal issue.

Nor is it long, before, the Pastoral Instruction, as to the necessity, the nature, the benefits, and the responsibilities of Holy Baptism, takes personal shape, in the training of the child himself. The Godfathers and Godmothers were solemnly enjoined, "to see that this infant be taught, so soon as he shall be able to learn, what a solemn vow, promise, and profession he hath" "made:" and "that he may know these things the better," they are instructed to "call upon him to hear sermons; and chiefly" to "provide that he may learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments." The sponsors are to see, that this is done. The parents are to bring their children, well prepared, to Church. The Pastor is to do it. "The minister of every parish shall diligently, upon Sundays and Holy Days, or on some other convenient season, openly in the Church, instruct or examine so many children of his parish, sent unto him, as he shall think convenient, in some part of this Catechism." What a threefold cord is this, of sponsors, parents, pastor! How hard to break, if it be twined, in duty and in love; and blessed, with prayer! What might not well be hoped, of children, so instructed, in the Church, and trained, at home; from the earliest period, when they shall be able to learn, until, having

"come to a competent age," having learned "the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments," and being "sufficiently instructed in the other parts of the Church Catechism, set forth for this purpose," they "be brought to the Bishop, to be confirmed by him?" Such is the beginning, such the progress, and such the end of Pastoral Instruction, as provided for Christ's children, in the Church. What duty of the pastor so plain, so hopeful, so delightful! What might not be expected of children, so brought up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord!" *But, it will take time!* What can be done without it? *But, it will involve labour!* So does every duty of our life. *But, it will interfere with preaching!* What preaching can be so plain, so practical, so profitable? No pastor, that has tried it, will doubt this. No people, where it is done carefully and faithfully, with love, will deny that it is so. In Churches, where there are two services on Sunday, this is the best appropriation of the second. *Best, for the pastor.* No man can do justice to two sermons, in one week. They will be two fractions, in the place of one integer. *Best, for the children.* They will feel, that they are in, and of, the Church; and grow up, unto Him, whose members they were made, in Holy Baptism, in all righteousness and godliness of living. *Best, for the people.* They will thus be kept familiar with the elements of Christian doctrine; and learn what they are to believe, and what they are to

do, to their soul's health, in nature's holiest and happiest way, out of the mouths of little children.

2. In a parish so conducted, there will need no other Sunday School. A Sunday School is but a jury-mast. It will be rigged only for an emergency. In their original use, Sunday Schools were well conceived. They met a present necessity. But they have grown into a habit of the Church; much to the hindrance of its purity and unity. They have superseded Family Training. They have superseded Pastoral Instruction. They have superseded the Church, in her relations to the Saviour's little children. They have introduced a body of teachers, without responsibility; and, often, more zealous, than instructed or discreet. They have become an organization, outside of the Church, and independent of it. They are like the Vigilance Committee in California; in the place of law and order, of office and authority. This is where they are not closely and constantly under the direction of the pastor. Where they are, they do but add to his labours, and lay another burthen on his overloaded Sunday: not to speak of the difficulties, and disorders, and dissensions, and divisions, to which they constantly tend, and which they often introduce. As a help to pioneer Missionaries, and to supply the want of pastors, in a crowded population, they may be used, to advantage, under due and specific regulation. But it is the militia of the Church. It cannot come in the place of the regular army. And, too often, it cripples its energies and

embarrasses its operations. These may seem bold suggestions. And yet nine-tenths of the clergy, and a larger proportion of the laity, feel their force and own their truth: and go on, under a mental protest, with a labour, which is hard to bear, and yields but little profit; because it is the usage of the Church. If there is a Sunday School in the parish, the pastor must be in it, and of it, and through it, and over it. And it will cost him more time, more toil, more care, than the proper system of the Church: and with small satisfaction; and no certainty, in its results. And this is without taking into account the drudgery that it is, to children: who must either be excused from one of the services, or groan under the bondage of a more than Puritan Sabbath; and learn to dread the day of rest, as the day of their imprisonment, at hard labour.

3. To meet the objection, that the teaching thus proposed is not sufficient for the case, the Pastoral Instruction should pursue the children to the Parish School. By this, I mean, that the children of the Church, on Sunday, are also the children of the Church, on week-days. And, that the training in secular knowledge is no more to be severed from the religious training, than their bodies parted from their souls. I am not tenacious of the name of Parish School. What I mean, is this: that all the children in the congregation, until sufficiently instructed, to be sent to higher institutions, should be taught together, in a school or schools, whose instructors should be com-

petent Churchwomen or Churchmen; and over which the pastor should have and exercise continual supervision. Six, against one, would be a fearful odds, in anything. How much more so, when the six days are, for the world, against the one, for God! As if religious training were like children's Sunday-clothes; which are hung up on Sunday night, and kept so until Sunday morning. It is a case, too obvious, for argument. Nor, is it necessary to meet the current objections, that it would be sectarian education; that it would be costly; that teachers cannot be had. But, why is that sectarian, on Monday, which is not, on Sunday? And, what is cost, when souls are to be saved? And, when was the supply not equal to the demand? We have not Church teachers, because we do not ask for them; we do not care about them; we do not encourage them. And, as for cost, what do men care for the expense of music, or of dancing, for their children? And, if the Church is one household, and all its members, brethren, what shall prevent the same provision for the week-day teaching, as the Sunday? Where, do we read of any question about cost, among the first believers? Is there another Gospel? Is there a modern Church? And, besides, lamps are expensive. And curbing is expensive. And public supplies of water are expensive. And a police is expensive. And all government is expensive. What then? Shall we have none? Could we live, without? A division of the outlay would reduce the one, to the great advantage of the other. Only

look at the thing, as it is. Only own, that it is, what it is. The rest will come. "Labour not, for the meat which perisheth; but, for that meat, which endureth to everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you."

It is not necessary, in this connexion, to go beyond the sphere of Parish relations, and of immediate Pastoral duty. The necessity of carrying out the same principles, through all the ranges of intellectual, moral, and religious training, results, inevitably, from their adoption, here. The soul is one; in time, and through eternity. And, there is, for it, throughout its immortality, "one body and one Spirit," "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through you all, and in you all."

iii. *The further Instruction of Boys, after the School Age*,—or, as the question stands, "when they leave the Sunday School,"—is an important point. Nor should it be confined to boys; though, in their case, lies the greater difficulty. Still, it is of the Pastoral care. And, if it be a duty, there must be a way to do it. It is too sadly true, that boys get, what they think their, freedom, quite too soon. Would it be so, if the Church plans were faithfully carried out, as sketched above; and the Church provision, faithfully used? According to that, they would either be Confirmed, or in training for Confirmation: since Confirmation is implied, in all who are baptized; and the Church expects it of them. And, more than that, Confirmation is admission to the Holy Eucharist; and, for this, there should be close

and careful preparation. A class, or classes, for religious instruction, Scriptural and Liturgical; the history of the Church; the Christian Faith, dogmatically presented; Christian Morals, practically applied: something like this would seem to be the best provision for the case. An hour, a week, would answer for it. It would run, through many years; and the Pastor, in pointing out the proper books, in each relation, collateral and illustrative, as well as principal, would be laying foundations for a life-long superstructure, which should survive the world. Young people might so be kept together, in a Christian bond. They would be knit more closely, to the Pastor. They would be incorporated, with the Church. And, what an opportunity to give the direction, which should secure, from both sexes, admirable teachers; and, from one, true ministers of Jesus Christ! Because everything cannot be done, or done at once, is no reason for not beginning to do something. The work will grow. The nucleus will gather. Interest in it will make it easy. And love and prayer will set the mass a-glow. The work will be too hard for pastors to endure, it will be said. And so it will; and so much the better, if it is. It will compel attention to the true nature of the office of a deacon. It will revive the order. "It appertaineth to the office of a deacon, in the Church where he shall be appointed to serve, to *assist* the priest."

iv. *Preparation for the Ministry as to Learning, Piety, Intellectual Power, and Practical Efficiency*, presents a world-wide theme. It might fill many vol-

umes. In this connexion, there can be no more than general suggestions. Candidates for the ministry must be taught and trained. Nothing is more certain. There is no vocation, for which it is so needful. None is so difficult. None is so important. How is it best done? Two plans have been pursued: instruction, in Theological Seminaries; and instruction, under the care of a Parish Minister. Both have borne precious fruits. The one has the advantage of opportunities for more varied and systematic study. The other, in its more immediate connexion with the pastoral duties, is more practical; and, as it were, more domestic. I have always been the firm friend of the General Theological Seminary. I think that it should be sustained; and that it deserves to be. It has some recommendations, which can be found nowhere else. At the same time, I entirely approve of the course pursued by the Bishop of Ohio, the Missionary Bishop of the North-West, the Bishops of Virginia, and the Bishops of Connecticut, in establishing Seminaries, in their own Dioceses; and I wish success to the Bishops of Vermont and Massachusetts, and to any other Bishops, in their attempt, to establish them, in theirs. I, long ago, adopted, as the motto of a plan, for training pastors, these words, from the Life of Bishop Burnet: "As, the qualification for the pastoral care was always uppermost in his thoughts, he instituted, at Salisbury, a little nursery of students in divinity,—being ten in number; to each of which he allowed thirty pounds a year. Once, every day, he examined their progress in

learning, and gave them a lecture on some speculative or practical point in divinity, or some part of the pastoral function." As "the qualification for the pastoral care" will be "always uppermost" in every Bishop's "thoughts," so, I think, every Bishop should have "a little nursery of students in Divinity." I have done what I could, with the "little nursery," which God has permitted, to the "deep poverty" of Burlington College; and I will turn out my seven, (all of them teaching, while they studied,) against any seven, who have been ordained from any other training, within the same five years. We must multiply our schools of Theology. We must localize them. We must habituate them to common life; its wants, responsibilities, and duties.

v. Nothing can be more apparent than the duty of providing *helps to the Ministry; as Teachers, and as Nurses.* The ministry takes in humanity. It must be the trainers of its ignorance. It must be the helpers of its infirmity.

1. The system of the Church, carried out, trains up spontaneous teachers. A Christian *will* teach, as certainly as fire will warm. The point is, to have him taught to teach. The plan, which is the best for training pastors, will be the best for training teachers. It is like the bolting process, in a flouring mill; there will be superfine, fine, and middling. Many, that may not be adapted to the ministry, may be well fitted to be teachers; and some, who have not the mind, to teach, may have the heart, to nurse.

L. of C.

2. Where there is a Parish School, there should be a Parish Hospital. I use it, in the largest sense. It comes from *hospes*, which means *a stranger*. Johnson defines *hospitality*, as "the practice of entertaining strangers." St. Paul writes to Timothy, that a Bishop must be "given to hospitality;" and he would have all Christians "not forgetful to entertain strangers; since, thereby, some have entertained angels, unawares;" while, of all the words of our dear Lord, there can be none, which touch the heart more tenderly, than these: "I was a stranger, and ye took me in." I say, then, it should be the aim of every parish, to have a house for strangers; for the sick, the poor, the lunatic, the aged, the infirm, the widow, the orphan,—God's outcast children, by whatever name,—and, *there*, will be the nursery, for nurses. No vows, but those of their baptism. No sisterhood, but that of mercy. No veil, but that of modesty. In villages and towns, but small, perhaps occasional; in cities, numerous and large; with troops of virgins and of widows, who will emulate the virtues, with the name, of Florence Nightingale, and find a home, in heaven, with Dorcas.

BISHOP POTTER'S CONTRIBUTION.

I AM requested to state my views on the three following questions: —

I. *Ought the qualifications of Candidates for Orders to be prescribed exclusively by the General Convention?*

I answer No, and for the following reasons:—

1. In a country so extensive as ours, and embracing such diversities of population, there are local exigencies, for which local legislation alone can effectually provide. We need not merely highly educated parish ministers; we need evangelists, and those of every variety of natural and acquired endowments; but evangelists who would suit Louisiana might not suit Virginia, and those who would suit Virginia might not be adapted to Massachusetts.

2. In all other professions in the United States, it is the *State*, not the *General* Government, that prescribes the qualifications of those who are to be admitted to them.

3. In the early Church, dioceses were almost entirely independent in their action in this particular.

4. In the Anglican Church, ordination in one diocese does not entitle a clergyman to establish himself in an other, without special license from its Ecclesiastical authority.

5. In the Canon of 1853, *Of Deacons*, we have, as it seems to me, recognised the true principle; devolving on the Ecclesiastical authority of each Diocese the responsibility of ordaining Deacons, without full literary qualifications, and relieving other Dioceses from the necessity of receiving such Deacons, unless they desire it.

Why not extend this principal to Presbyters?

II. *In admitting to our ministry those who have been licensed or ordained in other bodies (Reformed or Unreformed), ought the restrictions, now imposed by Canon, to be insisted on?*

(a.) In *respect to time.*—Six months is now the minimum term of probation; and, this being imposed by a Canon of the General Convention, the understanding is that, at the expiration of that time, the candidate is *entitled* to ordination, if, with an unimpeached character, he can pass the requisite examinations. I object to this,

1. Because the period of preparation cannot be defined for all. Some men, who have ministered in other bodies, would be better prepared after six days than others after six or twice six months. Men of mature age, of extensive learning, of tried and revered character, who have been widely and honourably known for years, who have long been studying the order,

worship, and discipline of our Chnrch, and who are ready to accept them *ex animo*; why should they be kept waiting, and proclaimed to the world as probationers for an uncertain privilege? On the other hand, men of doubtful character, or weak intellect, ought not to esteem themselves entitled to *demand* admission, because they have waited six months, can pass a slender examination, and procure certain testimonials. The effect of the present system is to discourage and repel the very men who are most to be desired. A further effect is to lessen the feeling of responsibility on the part of the Bishops and Standing Committees. If, after ordaining persons at their discretion, they were obliged to retain them until the authorities of other Dioceses applied to have them transferred, would there not be more care than there now is?

2. The provision is often a hardship. Subsistence in one field of labour must be surrendered; and, for half a year, the Candidate, burdened perhaps with a family, must draw upon his private resources, or be dependent on charity, or betake himself to teaching, which, being a temporary expedient, affords but slim support to him, and doubtful advantage to his pupils. Let it be added, that, while teaching, he can do little to improve himself in knowledge, and may unjustly prejudice himself in reputation.

3. This provision, with others related to it, is made, by our Canons, to work invidiously, as between the Reformed and Unreformed Churches. If the Candi-

date come from Rome, the Canon says nothing of his being examined on his knowledge of the principles of our Communion, or of his loyalty towards them. If he come from Geneva, or from any other type of Protestantism, "special regard," says Canon VII., of 1838, "shall be had to those points in which the denomination whence he comes differs from this Church, with a view of testing his information and soundness in the same, and also to the ascertaining that he is adequately acquainted with the Liturgy and Offices of this Church." If he come from Rome, the certificate of two presbyters to his character is sufficient, and that in terms of the most general character, and no testimonial in regard to his literary qualifications nor examination in the presence of two presbyters, respecting his theological attainments, is required. Whereas, if he come from Geneva, or other Protestant school, the closest scrutiny, in these respects, is to be instituted; and, besides two Presbyters, at least twelve persons of his own denomination, or of this Church, must certify to his moral and religious character.

It is submitted that, if a discrimination of this kind be made, it should not be one that works against the children of the Reformation.

(b.) Another question proposed is,—

Whether, in all cases, we should exact of Candidates for our orders the pledge of entire conformity to our mode of worship, and system of discipline? It is evident that this pledge is qualified by the circumstances

in which the clergyman is placed. If he be in a heathen land, or dealing with a population that cannot read, it is clear that the Office for Morning and Evening Prayer cannot be said. So, if he deal with a people, into whose language our Offices have not been translated, or who may not be prepared to use them in their entireness. It is understood that the Norwegian congregations, in Wisconsin and other Western States, have not even yet, after more than ten years, been brought to the use of our Liturgy, though their ministers and people are recognised as of our Communion. How far might the same principle be applied to those speaking the English language, who might desire our Ministry and Sacraments, but who are not yet prepared to adopt, in whole, or even in part, our form of worship? It will not be contended that our particular Liturgy is of the essence of the Church Catholic, nor that there could not be Episcopalians, who worshipped after another form, or without any prescript form at all.

These questions open the whole subject of Church Comprehension and Church Unity, raised by the Memorialists. That the divided and distracted state of Christendom is a reproach and curse will not be denied. It has had its origin in the pride and unreasonable pertinacity, not of separatists only, but generally of those too, it must be admitted, from whom they separated. Had the Church of England adopted a more generous and tolerant course towards the nonconformists of earlier days, and towards the Wesley-

ans of the last century, it can hardly be doubted that she would have averted some of the sorest breaches which have been made in her walls. That alone, which might have prevented separation, can restore unity. But it is much more difficult to heal a breach once made, than it is at first to prevent it. The remembrance of real or supposed wrongs; the bitterness engendered by strife; fear lest concession compromise dignity, or involve the loss of power; the chronic effect of habit; love of pre-eminence in some, and disposition to exact humiliating submission in others, all conspire to perpetuate divisions, especially when they have gone the length of separation into independent communions. To this we are to add honest differences of opinion, which are inevitable on such a subject as Christian doctrine, and which are inveterate in proportion as they enter into terms of Communion. No one can read the Acts of the Apostles without seeing that the proclivity to divisions was active even in their day; and they had hardly withdrawn, with their Divine gifts, from the administration of the Gospel, before divisions began to ripen into heresies and schisms. The Catholic Unity, under which, after four centuries of active controversy, the Church settled down, was the result rather of coercion than of choice, and it was not generally distinguished by comprehensiveness, either of doctrine or of spirit. Nothing but a strong consciousness of power, without a corresponding sentiment of right, could have inaugurated the policy which proscribed so many holy men

for slight aberrations of opinion, and arrogated to the decisions of fallible Councils all the attributes of Omniscience and Omnipotence.

If we would see unity restored to the Christian world, we must labour for it under the inspiring influence of Faith, Hope, and Charity. We need more faith, that we may pray more fervently and constantly, that all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity may be joined together in *the unity of the Spirit* and *the bond of peace*, and also that we may be more willing to intrust to Christ the care of his own Church and Gospel, and confide less in *our* ability to protect and guide them. We need more *Hope*, that we may be less disposed to despair of the future, and be more cordial in our efforts after a true Christian Unity. We need more *Charity*, that we may see in those who are separated from us all that they have which is meritorious,—that we may be willing to learn of them, if in any respect they excel us,—that we may judge kindly and indulgently of their defects, and mourn rather than exult over their failures and miscarriages.

Too stringent a demand for *uniformity in doctrine and worship* has doubtless been one grand source of divisions. This appetite seems to grow by what it feeds on. The Latin Church passes her Tridentine decrees, which exact from every earnest thinker a more abject submission than had ever been exacted before, just at the time when her desire for unity and her love for souls ought to have prompted a course precisely the reverse. This disposition to exalt mere

opinions into *articles of faith* is the bane alike of ultra Montanism and ultra Protestantism. God, in his mercy, has thus far saved the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country from the same excess of folly. We ask of those who come to Baptism but a hearty assent to the faith as exhibited in the Apostles' Creed, and that only on the ground that the few articles of that creed can be vindicated by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture. The theory of our Church recognises the cardinal fact that large diversities of opinion are compatible with loyalty to a common Saviour. It calls us to consider Christianity as a *Life*, not as a mere collection of *dogmas*. It asks how men live,—soberly or sensually, righteously or unrighteously, godly or godlessly,—rather than what in all particulars, speculative as well as practical, they may happen to think. She does not underrate the importance of the faith once delivered to the Saints, but she would secure it by moral rather than by intellectual means; by proper culture and training in the duties of Life, and in the hopes and services of Religion rather than through theological controversies.

Would that her practice might, in every respect, accord with her theory! Catholic she is, with her open Bible, her two great creeds, her Apostolic Ministry, her Sacraments the centres of Christian Communion. Might she not be more Catholic in her practice? In dealing with the vast varieties of culture and faith in our land, might she not wisely adopt a greater diversity of methods? To pass the debt which we owe

to the millions who are left without any gospel, do we not owe something to those who hold that Gospel, but walk not with us? We have an Evangelic faith, which the Protestant respects. We have an ancient polity and worship, which entitles us as an *historical* Church to the sympathy of all who reverence age and authority. We claim to have "gifts" such as are possessed by no other reformed communion, except our Mother Church, in Britain. Do we not hold these gifts as stewards, and are we not bound to act on the principle that it is more blessed to give than to receive? If Catholic order and Catholic truth be ours in a greater degree than belongs to others, does it become us to sit down and wait till those without come and humbly ask us for a share, or is it not rather our duty to offer and even press them on their acceptance? So far as authority and jurisdiction are concerned, we are to claim them only over those who profess and call themselves Episcopalians; but, so far as preaching Christ and Him crucified is concerned, are we not debtors, both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise? Should we give the sacraments only to those who will in advance pledge themselves to conform for ever to our form of worship? Shall our orders never be extended except where we can carry all the other peculiarities of our communion? Is not this to impart to the Episcopate the character of a denominational or sectarian rather than of a Catholic institution?

Advances towards the restoration of Christian unity

can be made more gracefully by no Church than by ours. With orders which none of the Reformed Churches question, and with a worship which the best informed of other bodies respect, though not prepared as yet perhaps to adopt; with a moderation in doctrine, and a position in history which inclines towards her the more thoughtful and Catholic of every other Christian body, the Protestant Episcopal Church can afford to be generous. It might be more *just* to wait till they, who have gone out from her, return and sue for re-admittance; but it would be more Christ-like, more in the genius of her mission as the Lord's representative among men, to go out to them, and offer the gifts wherewith she is intrusted.* The sectarian spirit may, in many quarters, be still so bitter and repelant, that any concession of ours would be hurled back with scorn. But it is not charitable to assume this; and even were such the ruling spirit in these bodies, we may be assured that in each of them there are Catholic minds that yearn for unity. At all events, we may, as a Church, repose more confidently on the assurance of our Lord's approval when we have abated every possible hinderance to the return of Christian fraternity, and have left with them who will not accept our overtures of love the whole responsibility of the schisms that now dishonour our faith.

To charm down the passions and enlarge the understandings of men, so that all who honour Christ in

* Dr. Howe.

their hearts shall come to see, eye to eye, it is not ours to achieve. But we *can* offer our prayers for it to Him, from whom come all holy desires, and all good counsels. We *can* see to it that, if the present distracted condition of Christendom continues, the fault is not ours. We *can* repress arrogance and uncharitableness, and cultivate the spirit which thinketh no evil, which endureth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things. We *can* remove from our practice all that is unnecessarily a stumbling block in the way of honest minds, and we can welcome every opportunity which opens to us the society of good men of whatever name. We *can* lessen the impediments which now make transition from the ministry of other bodies to our own both difficult and humiliating. We *can* consider that, if ever Christians are to be brought into one fold, it will not be through a policy like that of Rome, which demands that all concessions shall be made by others, none by ourselves. Above all, we *can*, within our own fold and among those who kneel at the same altar, cultivate a more loving and charitable spirit, remembering that we must be more at peace among ourselves before we can act efficiently as the peace-makers of Christendom. We *can* recognise, in much that is now transpiring, an open door for our work, and one which we are bound to enter. Is it nothing that the English language and literature, so indissolubly associated with our Church, is travelling round the globe? Is it nothing that historical studies have revived with an enthusiasm and earnestness rarely ever witnessed

before, and that these studies must lead far toward a vindication of our claims? Is it nothing that almost every other Protestant Communion is now moving towards some system of prescript prayer? Is it nothing that our polity so conservative; our worship so chaste, and yet so fervent,—so fitted to exalt the rude and to cheer and edify the cultivated and wise; our discipline so gentle, and yet so decided; our system of Christian nurture so fitted to rear up a nation of Christian men and women: is it nothing, we say, that all this,—amidst the din of strife, and the confusion of change,—is getting every day to be better understood, and more thoroughly appreciated? And why? Is it not that the Episcopalians of this day may arise and quit themselves like men? Is it not that we should bear continually in mind that to whom much is given, of them will much be required? "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord; for not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth."

A. POTTER.

PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 1st, 1855.

BISHOP BURGESS' CONTRIBUTION.

THE only liturgical services prescribed in the New Testament, are, the Lord's Prayer; the form of baptism; the words of institution at the Lord's Supper; the forms of benediction; the use of the book of Psalms; and the closing Amen.

There are no historical proofs which extend our knowledge of Apostolic usage. In the beginning of the second century, apparent traces are seen of the practices of reading the Ten Commandments, and of singing the Gloria in Excelsis. Some observances in the celebration of the sacraments, which are the same in all the ancient liturgies, have probably a like antiquity with these practices. The outline which was thus formed for the celebration of divine offices, was filled up with prayers which undoubtedly had a general resemblance, but which did not literally correspond in different churches, and have not been preserved. Every bishop exercised the right and duty of preparing or regulating the devotions which were performed

by himself or the presbyters of his church and diocese; and there is no proof that they were not in part extemporaneous.

This right and duty were never abandoned. The forms which commended themselves by their excellence, or by the authority of those from whom they emanated or of the churches in which they were employed, came into use in neighbouring churches. It is probable, but it rests upon no conclusive evidence, till four centuries were past, that provincial synods may sometimes have witnessed consultations which resulted in the harmonious adoption of the same service throughout a limited region. But if the power was ever relinquished by individual bishops or dioceses, it was a spontaneous act; and there was never any effort to produce an universal uniformity.

Even when the authority of the Romish See was at its height, this was never attempted. Different countries, and different churches in the same country, had their own rituals. Neither while endeavouring to draw the Oriental communions within its sphere, nor while controlling the West, did the Papacy seek to establish a full consent in all forms and words of worship.

Till the Reformation, several varieties of usage prevailed in the different cathedrals and dioceses of England. The Book of Common Prayer for the first time settled that uniformity which has been so striking, and in some respects so peculiar a feature of our communion. At first, the very opposition to Popery, and

the dread of its restoration, made the union of the whole nation under one ritual a great necessity. Afterwards, the resistance which was offered to such union from another side, only strengthened, in the course of events, the stringency with which it was exacted. Ultimately, adherence to the exact and unchanging form of the Liturgy became a matter of hereditary and personal affection for that form, confirmed by admiration and experience of its beauties and excellencies. Those who loved it not, had separated from the Church; and those who loved it, loved, from long association, even its minutest peculiarities.

Nevertheless, the Common Prayer has been several times varied. In its existing form among ourselves, it is the result of repeated adaptations and expansions: partly prompted by the simple duty of making it more complete; partly constrained by the changes which time had brought, in language, in political relations, and in the customs of society; and partly elicited by the petitions and objections of those who alleged causes, sufficient or insufficient, for dissatisfaction. In the original preface of 1549, the rule of uniformity was established to the express exclusion of a more ancient variety: "Where heretofore there hath been great diversity in praying and singing within churches in this realm, some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, some the use of Bangor, some of York, and some of Lincoln: now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use." It is also declared that the ceremonies which

remain are "retained for a discipline and order, which, upon just causes, may be altered and changed, and therefore are not to be esteemed equal with God's law:" and the broad sentence is added, "In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only; for we think it convenient, that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without errors or superstition." The revision of 1552 was stated, in the act by which its work was made binding, to have taken place "as well for the more plain and manifest explanation of the fashion and manner of the ministration of the common service, as for the more perfection of the said order." At the revision of 1559, when the Sunday Lessons were appointed, the design was declared to be that "chapters or parcels of less edification might be removed, and others more profitable might supply their rooms." The purpose of the revision of 1604 was proclaimed to be "that some small things might rather be explained than changed," "for that in a matter concerning the service of God we were nice, or rather jealous," says the royal authority, "that the public form thereof should be free not only from blame, but from suspicion." The preface adopted at the revision of 1662, commences with the statement that "it hath been the wisdom of the Church, ever since the first compiling of her public liturgy, to keep the mean

between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting, any variation from it." It declares that "the particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, are things in their own nature indifferent, and alterable, and so acknowledged;" and that "it is but reasonable that, upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place of authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient." Then, besides other improvements, "it was thought convenient that some prayers and thanksgivings, fitted to special occasions, should be added in their due places, particularly for those at sea, together with an office for the baptism of such as are of riper years;" an office which, "by the growth of Anabaptism," it was said, "is now become necessary, and may be always useful for the baptizing of natives in our plantations, and others converted to the faith." The Commission for a revision in 1689, cited the language of this preface, as the foundation for the "great and good work," as our Church has termed it, which was then proposed, but which fell to the ground. In the very same words, the same principles are expressed in the preface to our American Prayer Book as the ground of that revision, and those alterations, which followed the establishment of our national independ-

ence, and the completion of the organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

So carefully have the authorities of the Church, with the full consent of its members, asserted from age to age the right, the fitness, and the consequent duty of making such modifications in the Liturgy itself, or in its use, as Providence might constrain, or as the judgment might approve, or as peace and charity might implore. The limits within which changes may be permitted are firmly fixed, so that all such alterations must be rejected "as are either of dangerous consequence, as secretly striking at some established doctrine or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ, or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain." The constitution of our own Church has guarded the exercise of the power against all hasty action; but no other guard has been thought necessary than the consent of two successive Conventions. Not even that restraint is laid on any alteration of liturgical practice which may require no variation or extension of the words of the Prayer Book.

There would seem to be five contingencies in which the changes, thus made possible, and thus permitted, become also wise and salutary.

The *first* is, simply, when it is evident that in any respect the Liturgy, or its application, may be rendered more perfect. To hazard, for this result, the safety or unity of the Church, may be inexcusable;

and the utmost certainty may be demanded, before a change of this kind shall be practically ventured. But should it be once established beyond the smallest doubt, that any addition or alteration would increase the excellence or the excellent influence of the Liturgy in any degree sufficient to compensate, and more than compensate, for the inconveniences incident to all change, it seems as difficult to say that it should not be adopted by the Church as to excuse any Christian from adding to his virtues or to his usefulness.

The *second* contingency is when, in process of time, words or regulations have become obsolete or unsuitable, and are already of necessity abrogated, or else maintained with the consciousness that they are hurtful encumbrances. Its urgency is abundantly written in the history of ancient and decayed churches clinging to liturgies in dead languages, and to usages which have ceased to have a meaning.

The *third* contingency is when civil or social changes require ecclesiastical changes. It is impossible that the Church should fulfil its office, unless it is capable of adapting itself to the results of national revolutions, nor unless it can go out from its venerable temples into all highways and hedges, and find men, and speak to them in that manner which promises to be most efficient, whatever it may cost of departure from the customs of other times.

The *fourth* contingency is when the earnest desire of any respectable number of the members of the Church, or of persons who are without its communion,

is urged in behalf of some not wholly unreasonable proposal of alteration. Their very wish, if it be deliberate, and uttered in a spirit of godly love, and especially if they ask only relaxation for themselves, and not a general abrogation, is itself an argument for the change; easily refuted, no doubt, by stronger arguments; but, where these do not exist, sufficient to prevail with those for whom nothing is greater than charity.

The *fifth* contingency is when error or superstition has been introduced; when that which was at first good and healthful has been perverted to the nourishment of falsehood or wickedness; or when that which was always evil has found entrance, and is now revealed in its true character.

Of the *first* of these classes of contingencies, and the changes which should result, an example is seen in the addition of the General and Special Thanksgivings at the revision of 1662; of the *second*, in many of the verbal alterations adopted at our own revision, and in the omission of the Commination; of the *third*, in the substitution of prayers for the President and Congress for the corresponding petitions in the English Prayer Book, and the introduction of the Thanksgiving service and the Family Prayers; of the *fourth*, in the permission to omit the descent into hell in reading the Creed, and the sign of the cross in baptism; and of the *fifth*, in the very adoption of the Common Prayer instead of the Missal and the Breviary.

All liturgical changes of every kind are powerfully opposed by the consideration of the danger of parting with some blessing already possessed in exchange for uncertain improvement; by the difficulties attendant on change itself; by the preference for all which is already ancient, and connected with the dearest associations and most venerable memories; by the peculiar sense of stability which has become a glory of our Church; by the dread of diversity of usage; by the still greater dread of innovations, more and more serious, which may enter at the open breach; by the dread, greatest of all, of changes in doctrine; and by many apprehensions which proceed from the very jealousy of a profound affection for the Church as it is, even to the borders of its robes.

On the other side, the necessity of changes, in the progress of events, even apart from the merits of each proposed change, draws some support from the desire to try all means of reaching the hearts of men; from dissatisfaction with the imperfect success of all past efforts; from a kindly wish to make the Church as comprehensive as a firm adherence to the truth will allow; from tenderness towards tender consciences which ask indulgence; from reluctance to assign absolute and unchangeable perpetuity to that which is but human; from the conviction that all which man has devised can be improved; from comparisons between the usages of our Church and those of other communions or other ages, which, however little humiliating on the whole, cannot always show an

equal preponderance of advantages on our part; and from the broad principle that Catholicity must imply variety as well as uniformity, that the Church of Christ cannot be always restrained within any limits which at any one period may have been expedient and excellent.

Between these opposite influences, the Commission have endeavoured to hold their way, while they invited the communications of all who either desired or condemned any modifications of the now existing liturgical usages in those particulars which fell within the scope of the inquiry. It has exceedingly lightened their task, that neither did they deem themselves appointed to seek, nor did they find the slightest disposition to offer, suggestions directed towards any substantial variation from the established order of our ritual. Nothing has been proposed which could jeopard its doctrine; nothing which would mutilate any of its offices; scarcely anything which would require even the alteration of a word of the Prayer Book, except as addition is alteration; and few things which could not be attained through changes in a single canon.

The length of the morning services of the Church has been the subject of much discussion and of some complaint. Of some forty written answers to the queries of the Commission on this point, almost all assented positively to the expediency of curtailment, and not one rejected it in the form at least of division.

To a suffrage so unanimous nothing can be opposed,

except the certainty that for the solemnities of the chief public service, on Sundays and festivals, the time is not disproportionate to the occasion; and with this, the attachment of pious hearts to every word of their accustomed and endeared worship. Even thus, however, curtailment through division is not resisted.

It is not believed that in established congregations, on the Lord's Day, under the usual circumstances, any material abbreviation of the morning services is either necessary or desired. Whatever liberty might be allowed, the whole continuous sacrifice of prayer and praise would probably always begin and end as now, in most of our churches. The instances in which the need of abbreviation is really felt, are those of services held throughout the week and the year; of assemblies which are not yet familiar with the course and significance of the services themselves; of clergymen whose health is unequal to protracted speaking; of the hot season in the south; and of occasions where additional services, such as those of an Ordination, a Confirmation, or a numerous Communion, extend the exercises far beyond the usual limit. To refuse, in instances like these, all power of abridging so prolonged a service, cannot well subserve the edification of the people, and must impose an exhausting burden on the officiating ministers, and perhaps tempt to indecent haste.

When, at the Reformation, it was made the duty "of all priests and deacons to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayers, except they were letted by

preaching, studying of divinity, or by some other urgent cause," the Morning Prayer closed with the collect for Grace; and the Evening Prayer began with the Lord's Prayer, to the exclusion of all which now goes before, and closed with the collect for Aid against Perils. Here was a service of sufficiently moderate extent to be easily performed and attended even daily. On Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, the Litany formed an additional service; and, on Sundays, the Communion office, as far as to the close of the Prayer for the Church Militant, followed the Litany; while, on festivals occurring on days when the Litany was not read, it stood forth as a distinct service from the Morning Prayer. How extensively these several services were actually separated by an interval of time in the common parochial practice, it is now very difficult to determine; nor is it important, since it is known that they were sometimes separated in fact, and since they were and are clearly separated in rubrical order. It was certainly intended that there should be an interval between the Morning Prayer and the Litany; but it seems probable that the Litany preceded, without interval, the office of Communion.

If it should be doubted whether the universal usage which had so long prevailed might not have taken away the right to separate these services, which, nevertheless, our Bishops, in 1826, termed "a reasonable and godly practice;" yet, now that it has been asserted and carried into effect in particular instances, it must be held to be quite re-established. It affords

an obvious basis for the removal of many of the objections to the length of our morning service, without the alteration of a word, and without any serious encroachment on that feeling which cherishes uniformity of observances throughout our Communion. When the morning services are to be extended by any addition, such as those of an Episcopal visitation or a large Communion, the Morning Prayer may be held at an earlier hour; or, should this be found inconvenient, it can be recommended to the congregation to perform that portion of the services, excepting the declaration of absolution, at home, instead of their family devotions. Another mode of division, where those services can be held on the same day, would be that of reading the Morning Prayer with the Communion service, in the morning; the Litany in the afternoon, preceded by the Lord's Prayer, a selection of Psalms, and the two Lessons for the Sunday evening, with two of the chants and the Creed; and the Evening Prayer, in the evening, with the Lessons from the daily Calendar. These changes may safely be permitted, at the option of the clergy and their congregations.

The same provision may possibly suffice, where the physical weakness of the clergyman demands a curtailment of his Sunday exertions. But since, after the experience of centuries, this can only be regarded as an exceptional necessity, it may require no other arrangement than that which is found in the usual resource of lay assistance, or in such abbreviation as necessity always justifies.

Where the daily service is performed, both its length and the unavoidable repetition of certain parts, are reasonable grounds of objection. Its restoration to the original dimensions would deprive those who attend it of the privilege of offering their petitions for their rulers and pastors, and for all conditions of men, as well as of the General Thanksgiving. This cannot be suggested; but the omission of all which precedes the Lord's Prayer, and of the Psalter, except a single Psalm at each service; and the entire omission of the Morning Prayer on the mornings when the Litany is read, excepting the Lord's Prayer, the Lessons, and the Creed, would reduce the daily service to a length which might make it more attractive and more common. But since the daily service is not obligatory, and is seldom held, and little attended, it may possibly be deemed better to declare that those clergymen who perform it have full liberty to omit such portions as to each of them may seem most expedient.

The instance of assemblies, which cannot yet be viewed as congregations of our Church; assemblies of persons little acquainted with its usages, and, perhaps, accustomed to briefer exercises of prayer and praise, is one which the compilers and English revisers of the Prayer Book were not called to anticipate. It has now become real and frequent; and the ministers of the Church must often preach the Gospel where the attempt to perform the entire service of an established worship would be incongruous, unsuccessful, and injurious. It

appears that such of the clergy as have been engaged in missionary labours, at home or in foreign lands, have generally felt themselves at liberty to yield, in such circumstances, to the law of manifest reason and propriety, and so far to abridge as seemed meet for edification. That this freedom of theirs should be formally acknowledged, would probably relieve the inexperienced missionary from much anxiety and fear of misconstruction. But it subjects him to other anxieties not less serious, and it is quite at variance with the whole character of our ecclesiastical system that he should be left entirely without guidance. There should be rules for his conduct, wherever rules are practicable; they should be uniform under uniform circumstances, and they should be so flexible that they may vary when circumstances vary. One arrangement may be submitted for consideration, through which, in assemblies quite unprepared to take the least part in the services, his own position may be rendered less embarrassing. He may be distinctly authorized to omit all the responsive portions. Reading then as far as to the close of the Lord's Prayer, he might proceed immediately to a single Lesson, which should be followed by the Creed, and by the remainder of the Morning and Evening Prayer, so thrown together as to form one continuous petition, instead of a series of collects, demanding the responsive Amen. This arrangement might be continued no longer than till a response could be secured, when the regular performance of the service would be easily

substituted; and, in the mean while, both the required ends would be attained, in this congregation of strangers,—brevity and congruity.

On the question of the better adaptation of Lessons, Anthems, and Psalms to the different seasons of the ecclesiastical year, and in general on the expediency of any change in this department of our Liturgical system, there is a substantial agreement among those whose opinions the Commission has drawn forth; except as the difficulties and dangers of any change are dreaded by some who concur in acknowledging the existing imperfections. The Lessons from the Apocrypha, which have been retained for certain Saints' Days, while all the other Lessons taken from those books have been dropped, are an exception, which seems almost adapted to discourage the celebration of public worship on those days, by assigning to them instruction of less value than is assigned to any undistinguished day of the whole year. That the fifth chapter of Ephesians is the second Evening Lesson for the Second Sunday in Lent, and furnishes the Epistle for the succeeding Sunday; that the Gospel for the fourth Sunday in Lent, and that for the Sunday before Advent, are one and the same; that the first Morning Lessons for the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Easter are so little connected with the solemn remembrances of that season; that the whole book of the Apocalypse—blessed as are those who study it!—remains almost unread in our churches on the Lord's Day, a feature peculiar to our American Prayer

Book: are blemishes, which, though not of the gravest kind, are yet generally felt as blemishes, and as capable of an easy removal. It is a much weightier inquiry, whether the whole series of Sunday Lessons might not be enlarged, so that many other sublime, interesting, and instructive chapters, especially from the Old Testament, might, once in two years, be read in the ears of the people on the Lord's Day. This could be accomplished either by a cycle of Lessons, which should extend through two years instead of one, or by permitting the substitution, on certain Sundays, of other Lessons, which should be placed side by side in the Calendar with those which are now appointed. The latter of these two methods would be the simplest, and would be liable to no other objection than that thus the same Lessons would not always be read in all churches on the same day; a kind of diversity which not only now exists in churches separated by the St. Lawrence and the St. Croix, but which also has place in our own cities, when the Apostles' Creed and the first Declaration of Absolution are read in one church, and the Nicene Creed and the second Declaration in another.

A wish has been widely expressed that either the whole Psalter might be so arranged, as to classify the Psalms for each day with more reference to their tone and subject, or else, at least, that in the penitential season of Lent the more jubilant Psalms might be silent; and it has been desired that, on the same principle, other Psalms or Anthems from the Scripture might, at

appropriate seasons, be substituted for the Venite, and for the other Psalms or Anthems which precede and follow the Lessons. The choice, however, which is now allowed between either of the ten Selections and the Psalms for the day, together with the appointment of special Psalms for the chief festivals and fasts, appears to furnish a very sufficient degree of freedom in the use of the Psalter; nor should any change be, without great consideration, permitted, which might result, as with the metrical Selections, in quite excluding some of the Psalms from all place in our public devotions. To additional Psalms or Scriptural Anthems, for occasional use, instead of the Venite, and before and after the Lessons, such as the song of Mary and that of Simeon, or any of those beautiful passages from the Prophets, which, thus introduced, give great richness to the Breviary, there can be no objection so strong as to outweigh the obvious advantage. It is, perhaps, the only particular in which the Common Prayer does not assert its Scriptural superiority. The combination of the glowing words of Scripture, matched with solemn music, all attuned to the subject, the occasion, and the special thoughts which are swelling every heart, can certainly be carried much beyond the narrow limits of our few though blessed Anthems, without hazarding any sacrifice of the simplicity of godly devotion. It would be an error, however, to attempt to give to the whole service a close adaptation to any particular and occasional order of devout sentiments; so that, in peni-

tential seasons, there should be nothing but sounds of sorrow, and, at festal times, only bursts of rapture. Worship would thus be in danger of becoming even histrionic and unreal; since, in a world like this, Christian sorrows and Christian joys are never quite separated.

The objections to the abolition and erasure of anything which is found in the Prayer Book, are founded on the opposition which is thus disclosed, to some long-established doctrine, practice, or language. The objections to any mere *addition* are unspeakably less serious, for if it be conceived in the spirit of the Liturgy, and framed in words not quite unworthy of such association, it can only be said, at the utmost, that it is new, that it is not necessary, and that it a little swells the contents of the volume. These are objections which the least amount of real value in the addition is amply sufficient to overcome; and, apart from these, the treasure is increased by every such addition. Few would wish a single page of the present book to be expunged; but it would be impossible to imagine that, when the last revisers finished their work, it was such as to be for ever incapable of receiving or needing a single page beside. Additions, therefore, to the Prayer Book, when they are solicited by pious and grave men, are by no means to be refused at the threshold, as presumptive evils. There are several which are thus solicited, and which it would be inconsistent with all candour to pronounce evidently needless. In some instances, the want is actually supplied

in modes which, though only intended to be of local or temporary application, become almost as general as the established ritual, or else form but very inadequate substitutes for that which the collective Church should possess. In many of the States, an annual Fast is appointed by the civil authority; and as there is no service for the occasion, fixed by the Common Prayer, the several Bishops supply forms, of which it may be said, without the slightest disrespect, that they are neither so well understood by the people nor so highly appreciated as the forms of the Common Prayer. That service which in most of the Dioceses is prepared as a third Sunday service, has no other authority than a gradual usage, under the silent sanction of some Bishops, and the direct recommendation of some; and, suitable as it is, it ought not to be thus adopted without that sanction which the Constitution requires for all additions to the Liturgy, unless we are prepared to concede the principle that, after the Morning and Evening Prayer have been performed, any other service may be arranged from the Prayer Book, at the option of each clergyman, under the general supervision of the Ordinary; a principle, indeed, which seems to involve no danger. The Burial Service is seldom performed simply as it stands in the Prayer Book. That service supposes the interment to take place in the churchyard, and the whole office to be read within the consecrated precincts. Very few funerals are in fact thus performed; and other prayers are used, both in the house of mourning and in the

church; and it would not be a task too difficult to be attempted, in the strength of God, if the Church should resolve to furnish every clergyman with forms fully adapted to the change of circumstances which time has brought, and yet strictly according with the tone of that holy and blessed service. It is universally felt that the Preface to the Order of Confirmation is not that which ought to introduce the solemn question which it precedes—and that when few or none of the candidates for Confirmation are very young, it is painfully inappropriate. Originally a mere explanation prefixed in the form of a rubric to the Catechism, which was prefixed to the Order of Confirmation, it has little of the character which would doubtless have marked a preface prepared at first for the place which it occupies. When the Bishops, in 1826, proposed certain modifications of some of the services, one was a more fit introduction to this office, which might now, unless some still more suitable form were prepared, be allowed to be used at the option of the Bishop, as in the instance of the Ordination of Priests, or in that of the Declaration of Absolution. The concluding direction to the sponsors, in the office for the Baptism of Infants, was appended at the same time—and some objections might be obviated, if it should be followed, in like manner, by a substitute which might be less liable to be misunderstood, and the use of which, instead of the present conclusion, might be optional. It has been proposed that a similar option should be permitted between the prayer which immediately fol-

lows the Lord's Prayer in that office, and some form which should not state, with so little qualification, the regeneration of the baptized child by the Holy Spirit. If, without touching the doctrine of the Church, such a permission could relieve hereafter the anxieties of good men of a tender conscience, and put to silence all needless controversy on the subjects of baptism and regeneration, these benefits might not be too dearly purchased; but there is ground to apprehend that the same scruples might not be satisfied till the structure of other parts of the Baptismal services, of the Order for Confirmation, and of the Catechism, which are hardly less strong, should be submitted to a revision, which can neither be expected nor desired. But should the wish for the addition of an optional form, in a single instance, be sustained by any considerable portion of the Church, it ought not, without the gravest reasons, to be denied.

Some additions to the number of the Special Prayers and Thanksgivings are asked in a manner and from quarters which claim the most respectful consideration, and on grounds which are not easily invalidated. The Church has adopted the principle of special supplications at certain seasons of special need; and has invited its members to solicit, in their hours of sorrow, danger, or deliverance, the sympathizing prayers of their brethren in the great congregation. Since such is its rule and practice, one much endeared to the hearts of the most devout worshippers, no reason can be assigned why we should thus pray for

those who are about to be admitted to Holy Orders, and not also pray, as our Lord has expressly charged us, that He would send forth labourers into His harvest; why we should pray for those who cross the seas, and not for those who cross the continent; why we should give thanks for a safe return from sea, or a recovery from sickness, and not for rescue from imminent perils by conflagration, or disasters on rail-roads or steamboats or elsewhere; why we should constantly present our intercessions for the National Legislature, and never for those of the States; why war and peace, famine and pestilence, drought and rain, should be remembered before the throne of mercy, in our united prayers, and not the common interests which may at any time be exposed in other ways to equal jeopardy. A very few pages, or perhaps a single page, added to the small compass of the Prayer Book, will meet all these wants; one form of prayer and one of thanks may be so framed as to be sufficient for every variety of disaster and deliverance; and at the same time, a Collect for the young, to be used at seasons of catechizing or in Sunday Schools, may be supplied; and the saddening thought may be spared our missionaries, that they are never more specially remembered at home in the common petitions of their brethren within those churches to which their hearts so often return.

A larger discretion in the use of hymns and anthems is desired in many answers to the queries of the Commission. The use of hymns before and after the

Morning and Evening Prayer, has always been permitted, since the publication of the English Prayer Book, and was indeed expressly authorized at that time; and our Church, in adopting a selection of hymns, which are "allowed to be sung," has only by implication restrained the liberty which still exists in the Church of England, of singing any hymn which may be approved by the minister. A selection of two hundred and thirteen hymns, had it been uniformly the most felicitous, yet as it could never comprise more than the choicest compositions which were in existence at the date of its publication, would in a little while be deficient. He who gives to the Church of Christ a single hymn which shall become a part of the utterance of all devout hearts, is one whom God has raised up for a noble and heavenly work; and when any hymn takes such hold upon all Christian consciousness, there ought to be a power to appropriate it to the uses of public worship. Such hymns are constantly added to the general treasure; and the problem is, how to introduce them into connexion with a Liturgy which is meant to be lasting; and, though not unchangeable, yet seldom changed. The difficulty is, however, only in the slight inconvenience caused by the insertion of a few new hymns in new Prayer Books; and may be partially obviated by printing them also separately. There is no objection in principle; and every successive Convention might safely be trusted with this power. But, on the other side, it is far better that the number of hymns should

be so limited as to allow them to become familiar to the memory; the number of excellent hymns is really very limited in our language; some of those which are contained in our own selection are hardly ever sung; and the power of adding to their number should be very sparingly exercised. Perhaps it might be sufficient if the right of congregations to sing other hymns than those in the selection, were expressly recognised; and if a joint committee of both Houses of the General Convention were always appointed, with authority to recommend any additional hymns to be incorporated into the selection, after being submitted to the Convention. That other musical services, besides those which are now provided, may, under some circumstances, be used to edification, can hardly be questioned by any who know the powerful and delightful effect of such services in other times and communions; alike the old English carol, the Roman vesper, the Lutheran hymn, and the Methodist chorus. The rule of keeping the great occasions of common worship free from a kind and an amount of musical performances which cannot be shared or appreciated by a large portion of the worshippers, must be held sacred. The effort on the other hand, to unite all the aids and attractions of sacred music in the praises of God has its justification both from the impulses of the pious heart, and from the language and the example of the Psalmist. While, then, the sober dignity and the universal response of the Common Prayer are maintained, it deserves consideration whether an additional service

of a far more musical character might not be arranged in which prayer should give place to praise, and the sermon or exhortation, if any there were, should be quite subordinate to the mere outburst of sacred song.

The great question, whether extemporary prayer, or prayer in the use of words previously prepared by the individual clergyman, should at all be sanctioned in our public services, is by no means to be viewed as absolutely settled in the negative, either by any law of the Church, or by any ancient usage, or by established principle. It was a common practice of the Church of England, for a long period, to utter such prayers in the pulpit; and they are found annexed to printed sermons, down to the middle of the last century. The XLVth Canon of 1832, founded upon the XXXIVth of 1808, which was also founded on the Xth of 1789, only forbids the use of any other prayers than those prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, "in performing the service," "before all sermons and lectures, and on all other occasions of public worship." As the language of prohibition, where no moral wrong is forbidden, must not be urged to the utmost strictness, if a larger construction is equally probable, this Canon need not be understood as prohibiting other prayers after sermons or lectures. But should the Convention, for other reasons, amend that Canon, all doubt may be removed. Should it be decided and declared that any minister may in the pulpit or after the sermon freely offer prayers of his

own composition, it is perhaps not very probable that those who are so accustomed to liturgical worship and so well satisfied with it, will much avail themselves of the liberty. But since the desire for such liberty merits no blame; since it is possible that in some minds an objection to the system of the Church might thus be removed; and since there are arguments of no small weight, arguments from the nature of things, from the primitive practice, from the absence of any scriptural injunction, and from the prepossessions of many Christians of the present age, in favour of the permission, to grant it freely to this extent would be a measure on which the blessing of the Author of peace, the great Hearer of all faithful prayer, might be humbly expected.

George Burgess.

August, 1856.

BISHOP WILLIAMS' CONTRIBUTION.

I AM directed to prepare and submit to the Commission of Bishops on the Memorial of Dr. Muhlenberg and others, "a report upon the subject of *Christian Unity*, giving such range to the discussion, as may embrace the topics referred to under the questions submitted by the Committee, in Class I., Nos. 3, 4, 5, 10." I suppose, therefore, that I am expected to consider those questions, only so far as they stand connected with the subject under which they have been allotted to me.

Question 3 seems to stand connected with the general subject of the promotion of Unity among all those who profess and call themselves Christians.

Questions 4 and 5 have reference to the more efficient and united employment of our working forces among the clergy, and bear, therefore, only indirectly on the topic assigned me.

Question 10 has evidently in view the advancement of Unity among the members of our own Communion.

This is a wide range, indeed. Too wide for any-

thing like a satisfactory discussion in the compass of a sub-report. Here, one must content himself with mere outlines, hints and suggestions. But to proceed to the several topics in their order.

The first question (No. 3) is, "*How may the influences of our ministry be made to reach the multitudes now living without the Gospel in our own land and neighbourhood*, (*a*) *by social intercourse*, (*b*) *by extra parochial services*, (*c*) *by philanthropic labours*, *&c.*, *&c.?*"

It were a very easy thing, in answer to this question, to draw an ideal picture of a parish that should present all these works, the object of which is to bring men into subjection to Christ in the Unity of His Body, as going on, in unimpeded and vigorous life. In other words, it would be easy to say what might or even ought to be. A combination of the twenty-two answers to this question which lie before me, would show how many things went to make up such an ideal; and how complete a machinery for its working might readily be devised.

But while we are certainly not to forget, that suggestions as to what things *should* be are valuable and proper, still we are, I conceive, specially bound to remember, that the first step towards making things what they should be, is to do the best we can with things as they are. This is always the beginning of all real reformation, as well as of all true advance.

Now the two great difficulties in the way of making peaceful aggressions on the multitudes living without

the Gospel, and bringing them within the Unity of the flock of Christ, are, first, the deficient numbers of the clergy; and secondly, the attempt to accomplish a work which is essentially missionary and aggressive, by ordinary parochial agencies.

This is not the place to consider the means by which the numbers of the clergy may be increased. But let it be done, and the great difficulty is removed. There would be a supply of clergy, which, on the one hand, would enable the larger parishes to employ a more adequate clerical force; and, on the other, would release many, at least, of the smaller parishes from the necessity of uniting in securing clerical services, and thus incurring the evils of non-residence, and a partial oversight. Then, in larger and smaller parishes alike, missionary and parochial work would go on, side by side, and the double duty, first of gathering, and then of training, which rests on any Church situated as ours is, would be, with some good degree of adequateness, discharged. It seems to me, therefore, that the labours and prayers of the Church should be directed to the increase of her clerical force, as the first and fundamental remedy for the evil which the question under consideration contemplates.

But, of course, we are not to content ourselves with doing nothing until the ranks of the clergy are so replenished that we can begin to work upon a larger scale and in a more efficient way. What, then, taking things as they are, can be done in this important matter?

In the first place, every parish in the Church can be divided into districts. In places where there is only one church in a town, the pastor can make this division directly. In places where there are two or more churches, the division can be agreed upon by both or all the pastors, and each can take such districts to oversee as may, by joint agreement, be assigned him.

The districts, thus arranged, can then be subjected to a system of regular and thorough visitation. The more such visitations are made by the pastor, the better. But when, as in the generality of instances would doubtless be the case, there should be only one clergyman, or, at all events, a clerical force entirely inadequate to take charge of the work, it would be easy to employ competent lay people as district visiters. And I am persuaded that if the effort once were made, men might be found who would undertake this labour, as well as women. This would bring about, it seems to me, precisely the kind of social intercourse which is suited to the exigencies of the case. For these visiters would be brought into contact with "all sorts and conditions of men;" since, of course, they are not to confine their visits to those who have been born and bred in, or become already connected with, the Church.

Through them also—each acting in his or her subdivision of the district, which, let it be observed, in passing, should be as *small* as may be—cases requiring immediate spiritual oversight, or temporal relief,

would be reported to the pastor or ministers; children would be brought into contact with the Sunday or Parochial Schools; Books and Tracts would be distributed or sold; sick persons would be directed to the Hospital or Home for the Sick, where there was one; and it could be ascertained when and where would be the best time and place for holding a Cottage Lecture, or any service within the limits of the district, for the benefit of those who might have been brought under these beginnings of a Christian training.

All this, doubtless, would be best done where there should be the largest clerical force; but I do not believe that any clerical force in any parish, large or small, would be able to work out such a system—the barest outlines of which have here been touched upon—without lay co-operation. And it would not be well that they should, even if they could. In country parishes, everything will, of course, come more immediately under the pastor's eye; and the smaller the parish, the more immediate will be his supervision. But were some such plan adopted, there would everywhere be at least *some* supervision, and that would evidently be a great advance on none.

I have not felt at liberty to run out the preceding sketch into details; and I feel that, in many points, it is extremely imperfect. But I believe it will be found to unite most of the practical suggestions of the replies which have been returned to this question; and it seems to me that it suggests an entirely feasible plan; a plan, too, which would relieve and sustain

our generally overworked and overburdened clergy. There is, of course, nothing new in it; and it is already, in many places, in successful operation. Above all, it requires no machinery of legislation, but can be entered on at once.

Questions 4 and 5, forming the second division of those assigned me, are as follows:—

4. *Ought we, or ought we not, to have itinerating Evangelists, as well as settled Pastors; also permanent Deacons, and a portion of the clergy more especially devoted to Theological and Biblical studies?*

5. *Can any method for division of labour be suggested, by which persons of marked ability in a certain line shall have their useful gifts specially exercised to the edification of the Church; and by which ministers thrown out of parish life, may yet be advantageously occupied?*

Three principal topics are here suggested: itinerating Evangelists, permanent Deacons, and division of clerical labour.

That there should be some method adopted of reaching men, besides the ordinary workings of parochial organizations, is, I suppose, admitted by every one; and has already been asserted under the previous head. In the early Church, this was provided for—and that antecedently to the formation of parishes—by the body of the clergy who lived with the Bishop at his seat, and from that as a centre, radiated, as one may say, into the neighbouring country. After a while, the conversion and Christianizing of nations

rendered such itinerant missionary labour in a degree unnecessary, since the conservation and training of those already brought within the Christian fold, were the works to be performed. Hence arose the parish, taking the place of the old itinerancies. But now the progress of civilization has engendered a state of things akin to that which preceded parochial organization. It has given us an enormous missionary work to perform in the midst of a nominally Christian country. And as the old necessities return, we must return, too, to the old methods of meeting them, in spirit at least, if not in the letter.

The need then is plain enough; nor do I apprehend that much doubt exists as to the way in which it may be met. The practical difficulty is in finding men to undertake the work of Itinerating Evangelists, or Missionary Priests, call them which you will: and if they are found, in providing for their support. Now this is a matter which must be chiefly left to the Bishops and Missionary Boards of the several Dioceses. No discussion, and far less any legislation, can create a body of Missionary Priests. Such a body will grow up only through prayer and watchfulness. And their selection and designation must rest with the Bishops. As men appear, who are moved to undertake such a work, and if the work is a real and needed one the Spirit of God *will* move men to undertake it; then let the Bishops try them, and when, by the aid of missionary or other funds, they can sustain them, let them, in God's name, send them

forth. Here, for aught I can see, the matter must practically rest.

It is all important, however, to remember, that if such a body of clergy should grow up, although they might be passing as opportunity offered into the ranks of the parochial clergy, and the parochial clergy into theirs, yet the two bodies should be kept distinct. And especially that sufficient provision should be made, that the itinerants should labour under the immediate direction of the Bishops, and should be stringently prohibited from officiating, except at the request of the Rector, within the limits of any Parish. Were not this provided for, the mischief which they might, even with the best intentions, do, would more than counterbalance all the good they could accomplish.

As to permanent Deacons, there is, I conceive, great room for doubt; inasmuch as I understand the phrase to mean, persons who should be admitted to Deacons' orders, with no expectation of proceeding further. It is obvious from the ordinal, that the Church does not in any case contemplate such an arrangement. The question, therefore, I do not care to discuss; nor indeed to dwell upon it farther than to say, that, whatever arrangements may be made for providing for an increase in the order of Deacons, and their more general employment in Deacons' work, I am entirely convinced, that in the country parishes at least, no arrangement will be of any use which contemplates anything less than the complete removal of

these Deacons from all secular employment, except, perhaps, the occupation of teaching. In large towns, where individuals are lost in the mass, this may not be necessary. In the country it is imperatively so. And any attempt to get on without it, will only tend to bring the ministerial office into discredit, and do more harm than good.

As to the matter of a better division of clerical labour, and the employment of many among the clergy who are now unemployed, little need be said. We are a young Church, in a young country; and we labour under a difficulty inherent in our position, that *each* man is compelled to do something at *all* things. But I do not conceive that anything can be done towards correcting this evil, by cut and dried plans and schemes, digested and arranged formally and beforehand. As time advances, the evil will to a certain extent cure itself. And if, now that this subject is fairly brought before them, the Ecclesiastical authorities of the different Dioceses will give it their attention, we shall be likely to gain still more rapidly. In fact, the matter must be left to the common sense of the authorities of each Diocese: and when they will second the natural course of things, which is already working in the right direction, the difficulty and evil will ultimately disappear.

The last question (No. 10) which I am called to consider, is: "*How may a spirit of true brotherly intercourse among our members be promoted?*"

I might, of course, enumerate a hundred ways for

accomplishing this great end; and might discuss the advantages and disadvantages of brotherhoods and sewing circles, and various other plans, which bear directly or indirectly on this subject. But I prefer to go behind them all, and say where I believe the foundation must be laid, if anything efficient and permanent is to be accomplished. Our people must be thoroughly and carefully instructed in the relations which they bear to each other, as members first of the whole Church, and next of the same Parish. This is the order in which these topics stand, considering their importance: if sequence of time be the regulator, the order is to be reversed.

While on the one hand it is true that we have attempted to perform missionary work under parochial organizations, it is as true that only rarely has the Parish been made all that it should be made, or the people been duly instructed in their relations to each other as members of the same Parish—an integral part of the universal Church. I shall not, I hope, be supposed to forget, that the essential foundation of all Christian brotherly kindness, is to be sought in the presence and power of the Holy Ghost. I am only suggesting the means of developing and cultivating what is already supposed to exist. Increase, not creation, is that of which the question speaks. And suggestion is all I can attempt.

I had prepared some further remarks on the general subject of Christian Unity, designed especially to show that the restraints—doctrinal and other—under

which we are placed, in relation especially to the extension of holy orders, are not mere accidents, and indications of sectarianism, taken up at will; but things rendered necessary by the abnormal condition of Christendom, and forming part and parcel of our true Catholicity. But my paper has run to such a length that I omit them, and respectfully submit to my brethren of the Commission the foregoing considerations.

Communications.

BISHOP MEADE'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Bishops appointed to consider the Memorial of the Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg, and others.

Dear Brethren:—

I have received your Circular, asking for communi cations on the important subjects committed to your consideration, and offer the following suggestions, as coming within the terms of your Commission.

1st. It has ever appeared to me that the Church does not make the most profitable use of the Psalms. One-half of our congregations, at least, perhaps a larger part, have services only once on the Sabbath; and, therefore, never hear one-half of the Psalms, in which half are many of the most edifying; while the other half, being read according to the days of the month on which the Sabbath falls, are read unequally. Would it not be better to have the whole of them, with the exception of such as are not so suitable for Christian worship, arranged in selections, according to the different topics of prayer, praise, penitence, &c., &c., and according to the seasons and days which the

Church celebrates; making some fifty or sixty in number, and leaving the minister to choose out of them as he may think best, except when they belong to a certain day or season? Would not this be better than the present plan, or than that of Bishop White, Hobart, and others, viz. letting the minister select for himself one or more Psalms at pleasure? Might not some of the longer and less important Lessons be abridged, as was proposed by the above-mentioned Bishops?

2dly. It has always appeared to me that the service on Communion days was too long. Inasmuch as the prayers in the Communion service contain nearly all that is in the Litany, and are therefore a repetition, I suggest that the Litany might be omitted. I would substitute for it, and for the prayer for all conditions of men, in the Morning Service, the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant, and use it in the Morning Service, in place of the prayer for all conditions of men. This prayer for the Church militant comes to us from primitive times, and was called the short or shorter Litany. This change would supersede the necessity of one of the changes of posture in the Communion service, which are thought by many too numerous.

3dly. The service on Ordination occasions is felt by Bishops, Clergy, and people, to be oppressive and injurious. The service peculiar to the Ordination is most solemn and impressive, and its effect should not be weakened by the addition of so much of that which

is read every Sabbath. I would suggest the omission of the Litany and Commandments on that occasion.

4thly. I would suggest that the same method which our forefathers adopted in relation to a clause in the Apostles' Creed and to the form of ordination, be applied to the declaration of regeneration, and being born of the Spirit, after baptism. In the Creed, we are allowed to omit the words "He descended into hell," or use some other. In the ordination of ministers, two forms are allowed, according to the option of the Bishop. Why not the same privilege of omission granted to the minister in baptism, or the use of another prayer, which might be proposed? I am persuaded that nothing would contribute more to peace among ourselves, and to remove prejudices from the minds of those who belong to other denominations and the community at large, than such an arrangement. It would be in entire accordance with what now seems to be generally admitted, viz. that a considerable latitude of opinion as to the meaning of certain expressions in the Baptismal Service is allowed. If it be allowed, why enforce on all the use of words which, by their sound, seem to convey a meaning which is repudiated by so many? I have long known that a painful difficulty is felt in the use of these passages, not by one portion of our ministers and people, but by a number who differ from them in other points. I believe that public baptism would be much more common, but for the reluctance to use these expressions before so many who do not understand or

approve them. Many parents, I believe, are prejudiced against the baptism of their children, and put it off, on account of these words, and their supposed meaning. I believe nothing stands more in the way of converts from other denominations, and especially such of their ministers as are worth having, than the required use of these words in our Baptismal service. A slight alteration in the preface to our Confirmation Service, or another preface, to be used at the pleasure of the Bishop, would also be desirable.

As I fear my brethren will be wearied by many and lengthy communications, I omit other suggestions of less importance, and sincerely commend them to the direction of the Great Head of the Church.

Your friend and brother,

WILLIAM MEADE.

October 4, 1854.

In the General Convention at which the proposition of Bishops White, and Hobart, and indeed of our whole House of Bishops, to make certain changes in our services was made and adopted, I offered, as a substitute, though I did not press it to a vote, that the minister who thought the Morning Service too long, might, at his discretion, omit, on any one Sabbath, either the Psalms, Litany, or Ante-Communion service; varying such omissions. There were some judicious persons, who told me afterward that they regretted it was not urged.

BISHOP POLK'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Rt. Rev. Dr. Otey, President of the Commission of Bishops, &c.

The lateness of the hour at which I submit this statement of the views I entertain, of the matters committed to you by the Church, is to be ascribed not to a want of interest in the subject, nor yet to the fact of my not having formed my opinions at an earlier day, but alone to the want of time. And they are now offered, not without a becoming diffidence, in view of the gravity of the subject under discussion, and the importance of the consequences which may follow, from any recommendations you may submit in regard to it.

I take it, the pith and gist of the inquiry intrusted to you, and through you to the Church, is, whether anything can be done, beyond what is now being done, to qualify her more completely to fulfil her mission for the conversion and sanctification of men.

I think there can.

First—I am satisfied our Liturgical services, *as now used*, are to a certain extent impediments in our way.

Second—I believe our Canons, *as they now exist*, cut us off from the use of a class of labourers in the ministerial office, who would be eminently available if at our disposal.

The objection to the Liturgy to which I allude, is not to any *doctrinal statements* it contains, though there are forms of expression here and there, not exactly to the taste of parties within and without the Church, yet it is believed to embrace and offer a breadth of platform, sufficiently extended to afford a satisfactory footing to all fair and candid Christian minds. And at all events, for myself, I am perfectly satisfied with it as it stands in this particular, and should think we would lose power by any change.

It is not therefore to the presence of anything to which I object, and of which I would be rid, that I am opposed, but to the absence of certain things which I think necessary to the completeness of the objects proper for the petitions of the Church, when she comes before the throne of grace as a public worshipper, in her aggregate capacity. There are petitions proper for her, demanded by her own condition, and the necessities of those for whom she is to plead, for which no formulas are provided, which ought to be supplied; such as prayers for an increase of labourers in the harvest, for blessings upon Mis-

sionary enterprises, for Sunday and other schools, Colleges and Seminaries, for State Legislatures and Conventions for remodeling the fundamental state law, and any other subjects, if such there be, of an equally general nature, and so nearly connected with the interests and honour and efficiency of the Church.

Besides such *additions*, a few words are manifestly wanted in the preface to the Confirmation service, to relieve it of a well known and obvious awkwardness where persons who have been baptized in adult age are to be confirmed, to make it conform to the facts of the case, and to the language of the address of the Bishop immediately following. I think also we want a larger number and variety of Hymns. So much for *additions*.

My impression is, that a *rearrangement* of the Lessons might be made with advantage. There are occasions where to my mind there is a glaring want of adaptation in the arrangement as it now stands; for example, during Lent, and upon other occasions, greater appropriateness, I think, must have occurred to others as needed.

I have myself also felt a desire for greater freedom in the use of the Psalms in the reading of the Psalter. But upon this I would not insist.

The chief objection, however, after supplying the *additions* above mentioned, lies against the *length of the service, as now used*. The feeling is, and I sympathize fully with it, that to be bound to use the Morning Prayer, Litany, and ante-Communion ser-

vice, much more the post-Communion, *on all occasions of public worship*, is to burden the minds of the people; the unexceptionable, nay, admirable character of the several Offices separately considered, to the contrary notwithstanding. Beyond the point of instruction and refreshing edification, lies the region of weariness, impatience, offence, and hostility. Our object is to arrest and fix attention, to secure sympathy, to inform and control the minds and hearts of those to whom we go, and to build them up in the faith and obedience of the Gospel.

Whatever facilitates this, helps; whatever stands in the way of it, hinders us in our work. There are circumstances in which *all* the services help us; whether in *such* circumstances, a different arrangement and use of them would not help us still more, is the question. There are other circumstances in which the use of *all* the service is a manifest and felt hinderance. We are David in Saul's armour. Many people see this at the time, and they feel for us, but for the success of our mission much more; and we feel as others feel. There is not a Bishop, I apprehend, in the Church, whatever may have been his field, who has not felt this, as he has passed over his Diocese; but beyond all, not one whose field has lain in the less populous and newer regions of our country. The principle on which all this turns is a perfectly simple one, and it is that which prompts judicious people when they wish to influence others; not to begin by offending their prejudices, and in imparting knowledge

not to outstrip the capacity, or the experience or the attainments of their subjects of instruction. I have now been seventeen years in the Episcopate; my field has been in the newer States of our Union, and I have had personal experience of the working of our system throughout this field; and while my appreciation of the beauty and perfection of the several services of the Church, *separately considered*, has grown and strengthened with my age and my use of them, so that I will yield to no man in admiration of their scriptural truthfulness, their beauty as human conceptions and compositions, or their pre-eminent aptitude to fulfil the conditions and illustrate the spirit demanded by such formulas, I am compelled to say, the manner in which they are grouped and used, under our rubrics, is not unto edification. We are not as powerful as a Church as we might be, if we had more liberty. Of this I am firmly persuaded. In reference to how things look as seen by one from without, I may observe that not long since in speaking to an eminent man of another way of religious thinking and acting, he said to me, "The rigour with which your Church insists on the use of all your service, is the dead weight you carry. That heavy cast-iron service, as used, hampers your aspirations; and if I were a mere sectarian, the last thing I should wish to see your Church do, would be, to give you more liberty in its use; for if she were to give you freedom in that, it would be the heaviest blow that could be dealt to

dissent; it is the strongest objection that can be urged against you."

What I would plead for, is, not to supersede any part of the service, but to allow, *under the discretion of the ecclesiastical authority*, if you will, a liberty to use or not to use such portions of it upon occasions, as in the judgment of the officiating minister may be expedient.

It may be said this is by *common consent* granted now, and must often be conceded from the *necessity of the case*. A safer guide, and a more acceptable authority, would be the express legislation of the Church.

In regard to those dioceses in the plantation states, there is known to exist a large population peculiarly accessible to the Church, which cannot read. Our business now is, not to inquire why it is they cannot read, or to concern ourselves with schemes by which they may be enabled to read, but to take them as they are, and to make the best provision for their spiritual enlightenment which is clearly and easily practicable.

Now, that our services, *as they are required by law to be used*, are not adapted to the necessities of this class, is evident. What then are we to do? One-half of the whole population of my diocese is of this class, and a proximately large proportion of the population of the dioceses of my brother Bishops around me. Is it not the duty of the Church to see to this?

I am perfectly aware of the extreme sensitiveness of the Church to any movement proposing to touch

in any way the Book of Common Prayer; and I have no doubt if we could know the history of the public mind in every age of the past, at which alterations in the formularies of the public worship of the Church were proposed, we would always find a like sensitiveness to have existed. It is proper it should be so. For it is a grave thing to change the channels through which the prayers of the faithful have found expression in their approaches to God, and which have come down from the past with the powerful influence, and authority of historical and traditional associations.

Veneration for the past, and the productions of the past, in these times of "progress," is a commendable sentiment. But it is possible to push a commendable sentiment to an indefensible extreme; and, for my own part, with all proper deference for the wisdom of those who have preceded us, I dare to say the men of the Church in this generation are as competent to judge what the Church of this generation needs, as the men of any past generation have been to judge of what was wanted in the past. And this I say, with the full knowledge of the fact that the Saviour has promised *to be with his Church always, even unto the end of the world.* Our experience is a talent to the full as important as any veneration for antiquity; and to silence it out of deference to the latter is sheer superstition. I find no difficulty therefore in dealing with this matter out of consideration for mere antiquity. The time was when the Church had no liturgical services at all; and if we

could come at the fact, we should find, I dare say, she was as effective in the execution of her mission as she has ever been since. We should not fail to remember that this whole matter of having a Liturgy at all, is an affair of expediency, *and of expediency alone*, and should take care lest we run into the error of investing so good a thing as ours in particular with such a character as shall expose us to the charge of "burning incense to our drag."

I trust the Commission will be able to unite upon some things, which, while it preserves to us all that is valuable in our conservatism, will so set us free in the arrangement and use of our Liturgical services, as shall satisfy the lovers of form and order, meet the reasonable expectation and demands of such as feel the present condition of things burdensome, and secure to the ministry such a measure of freedom as shall give to their labours the greatest amount of efficiency.

But another point submitted for consideration is, whether the efficiency of the Church could be promoted by altering the policy she has hitherto generally pursued in the selection of the men she has commissioned in her ministry.

I am well satisfied she has been too stringent in this particular.

And in the outset I desire to say, that nothing could be further from my mind than the thought of tolerating a lowering of the general standard of clerical attainments. That the amplest provision should

be made for the cultivation of those designed for the service of the Church is conceded as a thing of course upon all hands. And that to meet all the exigencies of an age of cultivation, the dispensers of the word of God must avail of this provision, is equally conceded. But that an equal amount of cultivation is required *in all*, will not of course be contended. For the highly cultivated among the laity, there should be a class of adequately cultivated clergy, and these in numbers large enough to meet the whole demand. But of the laity, as a whole, a very small proportion belong to this class. The vast mass, "the masses," are in no need of teachers of such accurate and full and polished cultivation. Nay, it is very possible to push cultivation until it will become an obstacle. This I think must have been experienced by many of the clergy of the Churches, in attempting to instruct plain people in private as well as from the pulpit. Cultivation begets a style of thought, expression, and carriage, which makes it difficult for the cultivated to adapt themselves to the feelings, the tastes, and sympathies of the uncultivated. It interposes a sort of barrier which prevents access. It is not enough to point us to the Church of England minister as a proof to the contrary. The difference in the social organization of the two countries forbids this being used as an illustration. In England, the visits of the clergy to the humbler classes, are accepted as acts of condescension, and valued accordingly. The sense of inferiority is felt and acknowledged. But it is wholly

different in this country. The very consciousness of any great disparity in intellectual and social cultivation superinduces shyness, and provokes alienation. Ordinary minds think in ordinary channels, draw illustrations from homely subjects and scenes, need to be dealt with in the plainest way, and in the plainest language. If they can get what they need in this particular in the Church, there is no inherent opposition to her forms to drive them from her. If not, they will go where they find what their minds and hearts require. As things now are, we have no proper provision for this class of persons in the ministry of the Church. They do not find among us the sympathy, the social sympathy, the conversational equality, the freedom from a cultivated and exact propriety, which their less cultivated natures require, to put them at ease. They feel under restraint, and go most naturally therefore from us, to those among whom they experience nothing of all this. And I am firmly persuaded this must ever be the case, until such a provision is made to supply them in the Church with a class of ministers just such, in their intellectual and social qualifications, as those who now command their attention and secure their affection and submission beyond her borders. The Roman Church understands this perfectly well, and makes the necessary provision.

I am aware of the dread entertained by some of our brethren of what is called an unlearned ministry. They forget that three-fourths of the population

embracing Christ's religion in this country, are under the influence of just such a ministry, in spite of that dread, and that without the advantage of supervision by the intelligence found in the Bishops of our Dioceses, to say nothing of their separated condition, or the crude and questionable doctrine of their religious systems. A remedy for this would be to open the door of the Church to their spiritual guides, and to give them, or such of them as in our judgment would be useful, the Church's commission, and protection, and supervision. The *people* will have just this class of teachers, and we see they are not without some reason for their choice. The question then is, whether it is best to let them provide themselves with them to the increase of schism, or whether we shall provide them to the curtailment of schism.

The fear that their being in our orders will lessen the *respectability* of the Church in the eyes of the world, is of the earth earthy, and not worth a moment's consideration. The fear that such persons will make their way into parishes they are incapable of filling, is shown to be groundless by every day's experience in the Church, as things now stand. That is an evil which will cure itself. There is nothing to be feared from that quarter whatever.

The obligation on the Church to promote the restoration of unity in the body of Christ, by every means not involving a breach of principle, is an obvious duty of the highest character. And it well becomes us, to whom God has given such a position of emi-

nence and advantage, to consider our duty in this regard. I think it cannot be doubted we should avoid the errors of our predecessors in being too stiff; and as we can afford to make concessions, we should rise above the narrow trammels of a bigoted devotion to things not essential, and sacrifice such as may be yielded without invading fundamentals, to recover brethren who are men as well as we are, and honest, and sincere, and capable men too.

May God, my dear brother, guide you and your highly esteemed and venerated associates to a wise and safe conclusion in the deeply responsible circumstances in which you are placed, is the earnest prayer of,

Affectionately, your fellow servant in the Gospel,

LEONIDAS POLK.

May 13, 1856.

BISHOP FREEMAN'S COMMUNICATION.

ANSWERS TO SOME OF THE QUESTIONS PROPOUNDED BY THE COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS ON DR. MUHLENBERG'S MEMORIAL.

DIVISION I.

Question 1.—There are, I suppose, at least *two different* "methods" of preparing young men for the ministry of the Church, employed at the present time: the one by means of Theological Seminaries, the other by private study under the direction of the Bishop of the Diocese, or some parish clergyman. A large majority of the existing clergy, including the Bishops, have, I apprehend, been prepared by the latter method. *Which* of these methods has proved most successful "in respect to learning, piety, intellectual power, or practical efficiency," must be matter of opinion, formed from observation and comparison. Undoubtedly *some* of our ablest, most pious, most learned, and most efficient clergymen may be found in each class. Theological Seminaries have their advantages, in respect to

learning and intellectual training. In respect to the promotion of personal piety and practical efficiency, there is much reason to doubt their superiority. A large proportion of the most "useful and efficient clergymen" that have come under my special observation have been prepared for the ministry *without* the advantages of a Seminary training.

If there were any means of ascertaining what *is* the "*prevalent* character of our preaching," one might be prepared to give some definite answer. There is, however, I am inclined to think, *one* very *common* fault in preaching, particularly in our large cities, which might, and, in my judgment, ought to be amended; and that is "firing over the heads of the people." Few of our clergy aim *low enough*. Their sermons are too apt to be prepared with reference to the intellectual and learned, the cultivated and refined, rather than to those classes which compose the majority of almost every congregation, even of the most fashionable. The consequence is, these last are but little edified. It seems not to be understood—that which I believe to be the fact—that the intellectual and learned are generally quite as much profited, as well as better pleased, with plain, unpretending, and direct preaching, than with that which makes a parade of learning, and seems to claim admiration for the skill and intellectual ability of the preacher. I always admired the good sense and conscientiousness of that parish priest, of whom it is said that, before preaching his sermon, he always read it to his cook, who was a plain, honest-

minded woman, and, if there were a word or sentence that she appeared not to understand, he immediately changed his language or the structure of the sentence. The aim of every preacher should be to convert the impenitent, and edify the believing; to win souls to Christ, and to advance in the Christian life those which are already his, without any reference to their rank or grade in human society. But, unhappily, there is a secret tendency in us all, Bishops as well as priests and deacons, to "*preach ourselves*," as well as "Christ Jesus the Lord." Yea, perhaps, the tendency is stronger in Bishops than in the other clergy, from the fact that they have a very natural ambition to stand at the head of their clergy, not merely in earnestness, and zeal, and self-denying labours, but also in the exhibition of intellectual power and eloquence.

2. The "modes of instruction, besides sermons from the pulpit," that I have "found specially beneficial and effective," are parochial visiting, involving that kind of conversational intercourse which has been quaintly called "parlour preaching," and Bible classes. My mode of conducting the latter was peculiar; and, as it seemed to me to be, in a remarkable degree, effective, I will, at the risk of being tedious, give a description of it. In order to meet the case of members whose diffidence or timidity caused them to shrink from a public exhibition of their arguments or a possible exposure of their ignorance or want of proficiency, and thus to secure the attendance of the greatest

number, I dispensed with the usual *viva voce* catechetical method, and adopted a plan which, though it involved no small amount of labour on my part, I found very influential and effective. It was to prepare written questions upon the portion of Scripture prescribed as the lesson. These questions were written in a blank book, which I kept for the purpose, and numbered. They were also written upon slips of paper, with the numbers to correspond with those in the book. At the close of the exercises at one meeting, the lesson for the next was assigned; and the questions were distributed among the members of the class. Sometimes the number of questions was so large as to require the assignment of *several* to each member; at others, the number was so small that there was not one for each. It was of no consequence; for all were expected to study the lesson so as to be prepared to point out, if they chose, any deficiency in the answers. These answers were returned in writing, and numbered to correspond with the questions, but without signature, and were placed promiscuously upon my table. The members of the class were left at liberty to seek for the answers at any source, and these were not required to be in their own language. They might be, and often were, obtained, I found, by the aid of parents or other friends at home. And, in this way, as the questions were often of a practical, heart-searching character, I soon discovered that thoughtfulness was awakened in the heads of the family. After the opening exercises, the answers were taken up seriatim,

beginning with number one, and (the questions being cited from my book) were read to the class; being corrected, if erroneous, and enlarged upon, if deficient. These answers, with my corrections, additions, comments, and a few concluding practical remarks, usually constituted a *full lecture* upon the lesson, and one which was of engrossing interest, as all had some hand in its composition; and was seldom wanting in evidence of its good effects. Some of the questions were so formed as to constitute a direct appeal to the individual heart and conscience; and, being pondered in private, with a view to returning a proper answer, were not unfrequently fastened upon the mind, like a "nail in a sure place." Most of my candidates for confirmation were from my Bible class.

3. The "influence of *our* ministry" may, I think, be made to "reach the multitudes now living without the Gospel in our land and neighbourhood," as readily as that of any *other* ministry, if the clergy will consider seriously, and endeavour faithfully to fulfil, the duties of the "weighty office and charge" to which they are called; that is to say, to be "Messengers," and "Watchmen," and "Stewards of the Lord;" not only "to teach and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family," but to "seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for his children who are in the midst of this naughty world." In performing this latter duty, under a just sense of their responsibility as "Messengers," as "Watchmen," as "Stewards of the Lord," they would not *confine* their

out-of-door labours to an occasional visiting of such families only as were known and recognised as pew-holders, or regular worshippers in their own respective churches, but would be diligent in going from house to house, and from neighbourhood to neighbourhood, in search of the careless, the indifferent, the impenitent; seeking their acquaintance, administering to their necessities, acquiring their respect and confidence; and, by these means, if really in earnest in their Master's work, carrying the Gospel to many, very many, who may now be regarded as living without it, and who have reason to say "no man cares for my soul." For the further benefit of such, they might appoint some evening in every week, in the several neighbourhoods, for prayers and a lecture or sermon, at some private house; and, if the unhappy pew system should not interpose an insuperable obstacle, open their churches for their exclusive use on some part of every Sunday. Much, very much, might be done in this way, by *every* clergyman, towards bringing his influence to bear upon the masses, and that without any *very* heavy increase of his labours. Indeed, I am persuaded that, after some little practice, he would find it *not* burdensome, but a source of delightful *recreation*. Besides, he might, by judicious management, derive much assistance from the pious laymen and women of his congregation

4. If by "itinerating Evangelists," be meant clergymen who should claim the right of extending their labours *everywhere*, and going in and out within

the bounds of the parochial clergy, I should say decidedly *not*. Such "Evangelists" would soon come to regard themselves as a sort of archdeacon; having the right to dictate to, and interfere with, the settled clergy. If ordinary itinerating clergymen be referred to, we have them already. Most of our Missionaries are itinerants, and there is nothing to prevent the increase of that class to any extent. Doubtless there would be an advantage in having *general missionaries* employed in every Diocese, whose duty it should be to carry the Gospel under the direction of the Bishop, to such parts of the Diocese as were not occupied by parishes and settled ministers; but this must be left to Diocesan regulation. I cannot conceive of the General Convention making any movement in that direction, without the danger of interfering materially with Diocesan rights.

13. I doubt whether any "*specific* means" for increasing adequately the pecuniary contributions of Churchmen," can be devised, which would be likely to be *generally* adopted. A means which might be very well adapted to the circumstances and habits of one portion of the community, might be wholly unsuited to those of another.

There is very little reason to doubt that our people are *not* sufficiently instructed on "the dangers and responsibilities involved in the possession of property," as well as on the Christian duty of contributing of their substance in proportion to their ability. I have

always held that *the fault* of the niggardliness, so often complained of in the Church, is chargeable mainly on the clergy: *first*, upon the Bishops, who ought, in my judgment, not only to bring the subject more frequently before the people in their sermons and pastoral letters, but also to enjoin it upon the *clergy* under their charge, as a solemn and indispensable duty, to give as regular and systematic instruction to their congregations upon this subject as they do upon any other Christian obligation; and, *secondly*, upon the clergy themselves, who ought not to wait to have the subject urged upon them by their superiors in office, but should feel themselves called on by the solemn responsibilities of their own office, as ambassadors for Christ, to present it to the people of their charge, as of indispensable obligation, and as almost as necessary to the completeness of their Christian character as the exercise of Faith and Hope and Charity. I am persuaded that our people, if as faithfully instructed, would be found as ready to impart of their worldly substance for the spread of the Gospel, both at home and abroad, as the people of those communions who now contribute *thousands*, when ours grudgingly contribute *hundreds*. And why should it not be so? Are we willing to confess that our people are wanting in Christian piety—are not really converted—are in a state of semi-heathenism? But if constrained to make this confession, then it requires no Solomon to discern where the fault lies.

Division II.

Question 1. Though opposed, from the beginning, to mooting the questions involved in the Memorial now before the Committee, I am free to confess that some "changes" might "be advantageously made in our Liturgical services."

(a.) *Not*, however, by "lengthening," or by "shortening,"—for I would never consent to touch, in the minutest particular, the integrity of the Liturgy,—but by "dividing," or rather *authorizing*, where it should be deemed expedient, a division or separation of those parts which were doubtless, originally, distinct services; such as the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion office; but which are now commonly, and by prescription, used as one continuous service. But this I should consent to only on the condition that all should be used on the *same morning*, though at different hours. The most natural division, and the most convenient, would be to allow the Morning Prayer alone to be used at a *first* service on the Sundays and other holy days, and the Litany (on Litany Days) with what is called the Ante-Communion service, followed by the sermon at a *second*. But this division has been deemed by many, already, admissible; and has, in some Churches, been statedly (on Communion Sundays, I believe) observed. If express authority for it be desirable, it might be given by the amendment of an existing Canon (XLV., of 1832,) without disturbing the Rubrics; as might be done for some

other changes, such as allowing the Holy Communion to be administered in the evening, or at night, and prescribing a second evening service. I see nothing to prevent the Canon referred to from being so altered and amended as to cover the whole ground of such changes as are, in my judgment, at all desirable, or ought to be deemed admissible.

(b.) I should be sorry to see any attempt made at alteration under this head; for, although one or two changes might be desirable, who can foresee the result of opening the subject to the operation of so great a number of differing minds, and tastes, and judgments as would be intensely engaged upon it. And I must say that I know of no such *glaring* want of adaptiveness in the Lessons and Anthems as to call for so grave an undertaking as that which is referred to.

(c.) I do not exactly know what is referred to in the expression, "a larger number of special services." I have perceived no imperious necessity for adopting any further *special* services than we have—if indeed we have any. The number of prayers for "special occasions" might, doubtless, be increased to advantage, provided there could be assurance that they would be framed to accord strictly with the *general spirit and style* of the Liturgy. But I should be sorry to see any added to our present number partaking of the character of ordinary impassioned *extempore* prayer, which, I much fear, would be the result of any attempt in this direction.

(d.) If by the expression "a larger discretion in the use of hymns," be meant a license to each minis-

ter to select them from any source other than the Prayer Book, I say *no* decidedly. By "other sacred music" I suppose must be meant anthems, &c., with words not contained in the Prayer Book, and to this *I* could *not* assent. And as to an increase of the number of hymns to be selected and allowed to be sung, I think we have had enough of experimenting in that line. Every attempt to improve our Psalmody or Hymnology has, according to my judgment and taste, proved little else than a failure.

(e.) I do not think them needed. A wise discretion in the use of the Prayer Book, if not already allowable, as I think, *might be granted* to Missionaries both at home and abroad; and this might be provided for in the Canon already referred to.

(f.) The "authorities of each Diocese" have already all the "liberty" that I consider desirable or proper.

2. I think so decidedly. A departure from the present rule would, unquestionably, to my mind, work only confusion, especially in regard to the intercourse and interchange between the Dioceses.

3. By no means. (a.) The term of time now required (six months) is abundantly short. Indeed it would be well, if any change were made, that it should be extended to a year. Consider how much there is to *un*learn, as well as to learn, on the part of most of those who have been ministers of other denominations. It seems to me that to be efficient as a minister of the Church, it is necessary that one should fully comprehend and imbibe *the system* of the

Church; and this does not come to many minds by intuition.

(b.) In this respect there should be *no relaxation* whatever. An ordained minister of *the Church*, not bound to conformity to the "worship, discipline, &c.," of the Church! How could it have entered into the mind of man to conceive of such a thing? And to impart holy orders to one who is not *of* the Church, and is *not to be amenable* to *her authority*, what is gained to the cause of truth and of Christ? Is heresy, is error of any sort, to be *cured* by the imposition of the Bishop's hands, by conveying Apostolic authority to minister in the name of Christ? And suppose the candidate to hold, and bind himself to teach the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, as set forth in the creeds; what security have you for his continuance in that faith? He owes no obedience to the Church, and cannot be controlled by her. With him the creeds may, as has been the case with some professedly Christian *bodies*, become a dead letter, especially as he is freed from the restraint imposed by their daily public repetition, as well as from the conservative influence of the daily Liturgy. It has been our boast that, under God, the possession and the constant *use* of our orthodox Liturgy has been the great safeguard of the Church against apostasy from the faith once delivered to the saints. And shall we venture to authorize, by solemn ordination, any man or body of men to act as ministers of Christ, without those salutary restraints, those indispensable safeguards? *I* hope *never*.

4. *I* know *no* facts which "indicate a preference on the part of ministers of other Protestant bodies for Episcopal ordination, if it were in their power," they meaning to continue in their present relations. On the contrary, the usual indications are of a contempt for what we call Apostolic ordination and authority, and an entire satisfaction with their own orders and authority. And I have reason to believe that, were we to offer them the privilege, *they* would, in the great majority of instances, laugh us to scorn.

5. This question is answered substantially in the reply to the fourth above. From *no* facts known to me should I infer a disposition on the part of members of such bodies to "make sacrifices of sectarian feeling for the sake of restoring unity." On the contrary, I am led to believe that very few among them would set any value on that unity which did not consist in all others conforming to and uniting with *them*. There may, possibly, be here and there an individual of another mind, but I have not been so fortunate as to meet with one.

I have ever observed that, when once convinced of the importance and necessity of Episcopal ordination to a valid ministry, ministers of other "denominations" apply *at once* for orders in the Church. And I have no reason to believe that *any one* so convinced has felt any hesitation in binding himself to conformity to her worship and discipline. Indeed, it is my opinion, that the strongest attraction to the Church, on the part of the reflecting among such ministers, is

our *inimitable Liturgy;* and that no one who *valued* Episcopal ordination has ever been deterred from applying for it at our hands, by a disrelish for that Liturgy, or a repugnance to being bound by the restrictions which it imposes.

In regard to what I have said in reference to providing for the changes which may be desirable in our Liturgical services, by means of the amendment of our existing Canon, without touching even the *Rubrics* of the Prayer Book, I have a few remarks to make.

In the first place, such canonical provision would not, so far as I can see, contradict, contravene, or in any way interfere with existing Rubrics. Nor would it be equivalent to the enactment of new or additional Rubrics, any more than was the introduction of the Canon as it now stands (XLV., 1832). The substance of that Canon *might* with propriety perhaps have been adopted at the revision and ratification of the Prayer Book by the General Convention in 1789, *as a Rubric.* But it was not so adopted. It was, indeed, an afterthought. The Book of Common Prayer was set forth as containing the liturgical worship of the Church; but it did not include a *positive* injunction of its *exclusive* use; and, therefore, some clergymen thought they were at liberty to abridge it according to their judgment of the expediency, or, upon occasion, to lay it aside altogether and substitute extempore prayer. To prevent the growth of this evil, and to fix the general practice, the Canon referred to was passed by the General Convention, by which

"every minister" is required to "use the Book of Common Prayer, as the same is or may be established by the authority of the General Convention," "before all sermons and lectures, and on all other occasions of public worship." And this Canon has been acquiesced in and obeyed, as the law of the Church, as strictly as if it had been inserted in the book itself, in the form of a Rubric. And no objection has been made to it on the ground of its interfering, either with the Rubrics or with any supposed liberty allowed by the absence in the book of any such injunction. And yet it is a Canon "Of the use of the Book of Common Prayer;" and such would still be its *title*, as well as its *nature* and *purport*, should it be amended so as to authorize all the changes in the use of that book, which I have referred to as being desirable and proper; and *all*, I hope, that the Committee will agree to recommend, or the General Convention see fit to adopt.

To make this obvious, I will sketch such an amendment of the Canon as I think would cover the ground of my concessions, and such a one as, if I live and need shall require, I *may* in substance propose for adoption at the next General Convention.

OF THE USE OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Section 1. Every minister shall, before all sermons and lectures, and on all other occasions of public worship, use the Book of Common Prayer, as the same is or may be established by the authority of the

General Convention of this Church. And on no occasions of public worship shall any other Prayers be used than those prescribed by the said book.

Section 2. In using the Book of Common Prayer, as required in the foregoing section, it shall be lawful for any minister, with the approval of his Bishop, to use the order for Daily Morning Prayer, separately from the Litany and the Communion Service; provided, that the two latter shall always, on the Sundays and other holy days, be used as a *second* morning service, whether there be or be not a sermon or lecture; except when the Communion is to be administered in the evening or at night of the same day, as is provided for in the section following.

Section 3. Upon occasions when need shall so require, the Holy Communion may be administered in the evening or at night; and then shall that part of the Communion Service, appointed to follow the sermon, be used after the Evening Service. And when the Communion Service is to be administered at a *second* Morning Service, the whole of the Communion Service, having been omitted in the morning, may be used to the exclusion of all other services.

Section 4. When there shall be occasion for a *second* Evening Service without the Communion, then it shall be lawful for the minister, commencing with one or more of the sentences of Holy Scripture, to omit the exhortation and the confession, and to proceed with the Lord's Prayer and the following responsive sentences. Then shall follow a portion of the

Psalms selected by himself from the Psalter; after which shall be read a Lesson selected either from the Old or the New Testament, at the discretion of the minister; then shall be said the *Deus Misereatus* or the *Benedic anima mea;* the Creed; the following responsive prayers; the collect for the day; the collect for peace; the collect for aid against perils; the prayer of the whole state of Christ's Church Militant, or the last prayer in the Institution office; concluding with any suitable collect or collects from the Book of Common Prayer and the lesser benediction.

Section 5. All missionaries and other ministers of this Church, who shall be engaged in propagating the Gospel among the heathen, or in places or countries where there are no settled established congregations of worshippers connected with this Church, or where the services of the Church are unknown or unaccustomed, shall be at liberty to omit such parts of the order for daily Morning and Evening Prayer as the necessities of the case may seem to require, exercising therein a sound discretion, but using no other Prayers than those contained in the Prayer Book: provided, that when they shall officiate in organized parishes, or in congregations accustomed to the use of the Prayer Book, they shall be governed by the same rules as other ministers of this Church.

It will be seen that, while the provisions of the above suggested amendment to the Canon, cover all

the changes in the service that seem to be most strenuously insisted on, they relate to matters concerning which some degree of liberty is already claimed, and, by no inconsiderable number, actually exercised. The separation of the three distinct services connected with the morning worship on Sundays, has often been made, and no voice, so far as I have heard, has been raised against it. Indeed there is nothing but *general usage* that can be alleged in opposition to it. The right to administer the Holy Communion in the evening is certainly not *forbidden*, and, I believe, has often been exercised. The use of a *second* Evening Service, not very different from that which is allowed above, has been quite common, if not universal, in the American Church, and was allowed and recommended by the late Bishop Hobart. The discretion in the use of the daily Morning and Evening Prayer, allowed, as above, to Missionaries and other ministers officiating where responsive services are impracticable, has been, of necessity, a thousand times exercised. The consideration of these things will show that the way of providing for the changes desired, by *Canon* and *not by Rubrics*, is the natural and legitimate one. And this way is recommended, above all others, by the considerations, that the Prayer Book is left *intact*, and that the desired changes may be adopted *without* the delay of *three years* from the next General Convention, which must ensue if any change in the Prayer Book, even of a Rubric, should be adopted.

In conclusion, I would respectfully ask, if this is a time, when parties in the Church are arrayed in bitter hostility to each other; when there is so much difference of opinion upon important points of doctrine, that the Bishops and other ministers cannot be brought to agree in the support and patronage of *one* Theological Seminary, of *one* Sunday School Union, of *one* plan of Missions, of *one* Tract or Book Society; when *one* part denies all claim to an Evangelical, that is a Gospel character, to all who do not agree with *them* in every particular of an interpretation of the formularies and standards of the Church, and the *other* party denies to the former any just right to the name of Churchman, the one party charging those who differ from them with concealed Romanism, the other charging their contemners with being Presbyterians or Puritans in disguise; is *this* a time to venture upon touching the integrity of the Prayer Book in any way whatever? When men cannot be "of one mind in a house," respecting matters that vitally concern its welfare, is it a time to set about remodelling that house and changing its character and accommodations? or is it at all likely that they could agree upon such changes as would constitute a permanent improvement? I trust, and I *believe*, that the Committee will consider well their position; and, *not* catching the spirit of progress for which this age is so remarkable, be inclined to adopt moderate and conservative counsels.

Geo. W. Freeman.

BISHOP UPFOLD'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Committee of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, appointed to consider the Memorial of the Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg, and other Presbyters.

Right Reverend Brethren:—

A Circular from the Reverend Secretary of your Committee, containing a series of interrogatories, growing out of the Memorial submitted to your consideration, has been sent to me; and I avail myself of a few leisure hours to reply to some of the more important.

The Memorial, in its suggestions and proposals, so far as these can be discerned with any definiteness amid its somewhat cloudy generalization, appears to be based on the assumption that "the Protestant Episcopal Church, with only her present canonical means and appliances, her fixed and invariable modes of public worship, and her traditional customs and usages, is not competent to the work of preaching and dispensing the Gospel to all sorts and conditions of men,

and so is inadequate to do the work of the Lord in this land and age." This is a sweeping and astounding assertion: her worst enemies could not have said a worse thing of the Church; and, if it be true, involves a cogent argument for at once abandoning a Church so radically and essentially defective in its organization and working agencies, instead of attempting to patch it up, as the Memorial proposes, though it does not intimate with any clearness how the patching up is to be done. But I hold it to be untrue and incapable of proof; a mere gratuitous assumption, founded on an erroneous ideal of the Church, and her mission, mingled with very contracted views of her actual working and progress in this "land and age." The growth of the Church, considering the obstacles she has had to encounter, from political prejudice and jealousy, and from the strong cherished prejudices and calumnious misrepresentations of the various phases of dissent, all combined against her, is a full and sufficient answer to this gratuitous and condemnatory assumption. And this growth has been the greatest and most manifest in those portions of the Church in which "her present canonical means and appliances, her fixed and invariable modes of public worship, and her traditional customs and usages," have been most strictly observed. Where they have been lightly regarded, loosely observed, or departed from to any extent; where irregularities have been practised, tolerated, and encouraged; where an attempt has been made practically to ignore her usages, and accommodate them to

those which prevail without her pale, there has not been the same growth, but quite the reverse. This is evident from the statistics of the progress of the Church, in the Journals of the General and Diocesan Conventions, from her first independent organization in this country after the American Revolution, and especially for the last twenty-five or thirty years.

But while I regard the Memorial as based upon a gratuitous assumption, incapable of proof, and for that reason uncalled for, I am far from regarding our Ecclesiastical organization and working instrumentalities as perfect, and unsusceptible of any improvement. And what my views as to such improvement are, will be developed in the answers I proceed to give to some of the interrogatories contained in the Circular from the Reverend Secretary of your Committee.

I. "*Can the present method of preparing young men for the ministry in the Protestant Episcopal Church be improved, in respect to learning, piety, intellectual power, or practical efficiency?*"

My reply to this interrogatory will touch only the point of practical efficiency. In this I am decidedly of the opinion there is both room for and need of great improvement, particularly in the manner and matter of preaching, and in the manner of performing the service of the Church, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

Generally speaking, our Clergy, the younger ones and they who have received their education in our Theological Seminaries, do not *preach;* they only *read*,

and that very badly. The subject-matter of their discourses, moreover, so far as I have had an opportunity of hearing and observing—and that opportunity has not been limited—are usually of a nature uninteresting to, and above the comprehension of, ordinary hearers; are composed too much in the essay style; and are unpractical, with little or no direct personal application to the heart and the conscience. They are, besides, frequently vague, rambling, vapid, consisting of crude generalities and common-place remarks, and display an almost entire ignorance of the movements and promptings of the human heart, and of the common motives of thought and action which prevail among the mass of mankind. These harangues, read in a dull, cold, prosy manner, and monotonous tone, and often very lengthy, with eyes bent close to the manuscript; or, if occasionally withdrawn, looking only at vacancy; with no gesture, or if gesture is attempted, artificial and inexpressive; cause the hearers to become weary under the infliction, fail to interest and edify, and lead them to prefer the preaching of the outsiders, who, with all their imperfections, are usually earnest and impassioned.

Now I am of the opinion that, to secure greater practical efficiency in our ministry, more and more careful instruction is required in our Theological Seminaries, in training the students in the art of preaching; that this, instead of being a secondary, should be a primary branch of education; that they should be thoroughly drilled in this respect, their defects pointed

out and corrected, and this drilling should begin with their entrance on a theological course, and be continued throughout the course; that one day in every week should be set apart for this especial purpose; and that incurable deficiency should be a bar to any further progress toward the ministry. I would also have extemporaneous preaching more generally cultivated. Or, if the gift of extemporaneous utterance is wanting, and, as is sometimes the case, unsusceptible of cultivation, then I would take the next best mode, of memoriter preaching. At any rate, I would have the preacher so familiar with his written discourse, by repeated reading thereof in private, that in its public delivery he need only glance at it occasionally, and be enabled to look his auditors in the face, and preach with his eye as well as with his voice. The people of this "land and age" are almost universally accustomed to this method of public speaking; they expect it, they like it, they weary of its opposite; and, to commend our Church to the confidence and affections of the mass, particularly in the West and South-west, we must adopt it, or at least approximate thereto.

And, as to the *matter*, greater efficiency would, I am confident, be secured by expository preaching, as a general rule, and by the disuse of the didactic and essay style. By this I do not mean entering into a critical interpretation of a passage of Scripture, but eliminating its doctrinal and preceptive truths; setting them forth clearly, and applying them in the way of practical personal appeal. In this respect, our clergy

have a manifest advantage over others, if they are disposed to avail themselves of it, in following the Ritual Year of the Church in the selection of subjects, taking their theme from the Lessons of Holy Scripture, or from the Epistles and Gospels. These afford a constant variety of most interesting topics, instructive, edifying, and eminently practical; and if treated practically, calculated to interest and secure the attention of the hearers, from the fact that they have been previously presented to their thoughts in the Lessons of Scripture previously read.

Preaching, then, and not *reading*, and as much as possible extemporaneous or memoriter preaching, at least such familiarity with a written discourse that it may be *preached*, and not merely *read;* and with this, popular and practical themes, adapted to the capacities and spiritual exigencies of ordinary hearers, is, in my judgment, necessary to greater practical efficiency in our ministry, and would commend our clergy to more general acceptance with the great mass of the community.

The preceding remarks are applicable also to the *manner* of celebrating divine service. There is a serious and very general defect in this particular. Our clergy, generally speaking, are not *good* readers of the Liturgy, and mar its beauty and impressiveness sadly by *bad* reading. There is, among other things, little attention given to emphasis; and when attention is given to it, there is much apparent misapprehension as to proper emphasis. But most frequently

the service is read in a careless and hurried manner, or else slow and drawling, in a dull, monotonous tone. There is apparently a want of appreciation of the sentiments uttered, an absence of devotional feeling, a deficiency of earnestness; and, if there is correctness of enunciation, there is with this a failure in animation. The entire service, Lessons and all, are read in the same tone, without discriminating between confession, supplication, thanksgiving, and the didactic portions. Now this, far more than the *length*, or the construction, of our Liturgy, causes it to be wearisome to those who are unaccustomed to it, and to some extent to those who are habituated to it. Before they who are unaccustomed to our mode of worship can be brought to relish its excellence, they must be made to *feel* its impressiveness. And this they will not do, if the service, as is too much the case, is read in a dull, droning, humdrum tone, or hurried over in a careless way. The manner of the reader must be earnest and impassioned; he must not merely *read*, but *pray* the prayers; enter into the spirit of the several parts of the service; and make them, so to speak, manifestly his *own* devout *utterances*, in order to commend our Common Prayer to the acceptance of the mass of the people, and prepare them to appreciate its value, feel its edifying influence, and realize its excellence as "the worship of God in the beauty of holiness." I would, therefore, respectfully suggest that especial attention be paid in the training of our candidates for Holy orders, in this important function

of the ministerial office. And for effecting this object, that a teacher of elocution be employed in our several Theological Seminaries, and a portion of the time of the students be devoted to this important accomplishment. The *manner* of reading our Liturgy makes all the difference in the world in creating a taste for it with those who have been accustomed to other prevailing modes of worship, while it deepens the interest and enhances the edification of those who are habituated to its use. If we would secure the greater efficiency of our clergy, we must pay attention to making them good *readers;* natural, emphatic, earnest, impassioned *readers* of our intrinsically beautiful, expressive, devotional, and edifying form of public worship.

II. "*What mode of instruction besides sermons from the pulpit, have you found specially beneficial and effective?*"

I regard catechetical instruction as an important instrument for the more effective edification of the people in the principles of our most holy faith. And by this I mean public catechizing of the young in the presence of the congregation. This may be made interesting and eminently instructive to both young and old, provided it be properly conducted. The plan which I deem best, is to make catechizing a regular exercise for the afternoon of every Lord's Day—an exposition of the Catechism being substituted for the usual sermon. And I would not confine the exercise to the questions and answers of the Church Catechism only, but would expand it into general instruction in

the doctrines of the Church, and reasons for the hope that is in us, with arguments and answers to objections. All this, however, in a familiar way, adapted to the capacities of the instructed. There are some admirable models of catechetical lecturing among the works of the old divines of our Mother Church, and among these, Horne's Exposition of the Church Catechism, with his extended practical Lectures on the Liturgy. In connexion with this, I regard the personal supervision of our Sunday Schools by the pastor—the making of it his especial care, and the not leaving it almost entirely to lay teachers, often sadly needing to be taught themselves—as an effective means of edification. And I would confine the exercises of the Sunday School to religious instruction entirely, teaching the principles of religion orally, in a simple familiar way, to those who cannot read, and dispensing altogether with secular school exercises, such as teaching the alphabet and spelling. And to this, I would add, Bible classes for the teachers, and the more advanced and older pupils.

Preaching from house to house; constant and systematic parochial visiting, with a view to edification, and not in a mere formal complimentary manner, would, in my judgment, materially increase the usefulness of our clergy, and serve, as much as almost anything else, to attach our people to the Church from right principle, and not as mere matter of taste or convenience. Seeking out the poor and needy, and mingling instruction in religious truth with ministering

to their temporal necessities, especially devoting attention to the sick and the afflicted; friendly intercourse with the people, having these ends in view, would constitute an effective instrumentality for good, and would eminently aid in commending the Church to popular acceptance.

III. "*How can the influence of our ministry be made to reach the multitudes now living without the Gospel in our land and neighbourhood, &c.?*"

To this I answer, let our Deacons, or a portion of them, be carefully trained to this work of preaching the Gospel to the poor, under the immediate supervision of the rectors of parishes, and employ at least the canonical period of the Diaconate, three years, in this sort of labour. Let them go among the poor, preach to them conversationally, and endeavour to assemble neighbours together in their own houses, for worship and instruction. Let cheap, unexpensive, plain churches be erected in given districts, and a general Church Building Fund be raised to defray the expense. Let the poor be invited to worship in these Churches, at free cost, except such contributions as they may be able from time to time to make, in the Sunday collection, which I would have a common usage on every occasion of public worship. Let a general fund be provided also for the maintenance of those ministers to the poor, and apportioned by the Ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese. Of the mode of raising the general funds suggested, I will speak under another interrogatory head.

IV. "*Do the laymen and laywomen of our congregation co-operate efficiently with the pastor in the work of winning souls? How can that co-operation be increased, &c., &c.?*"

This is an inquiry I find it difficult to answer, from the want of sufficient information. I am under the impression they do not. But as our Church is situated in this country, exclusively under the voluntary system, with a very limited ecclesiastical control, I do not clearly perceive how a remedy is to be provided. The personal influence of the pastor is the only reliable power in this case. District visiting, and weekly meetings of district visiters, would be a social organization of the parishioners, which would be beneficial in promoting the co-operation contemplated. Sewing circles, in small parishes, at which, in the evening, the pastor, with the male members of the parish, attend, I have known to be instrumental in increasing social intercourse in parishes, and bringing different classes and conditions into contact, with a view to increased co-operation in works of charity and mercy. The appointment of monthly committees for visiting and nursing the sick, it has occurred to me, might be a useful parochial agency.

V. "*By what specific means can we increase adequately the pecuniary contributions of Churchmen, to the work of evangelizing our own land and the world at large?*"

In reference to our own land, I think the contributions of Churchmen might be materially and perma-

nently increased, by adopting the practice of one class of outsiders, the Methodists, in their admirable fiscal arrangements. It is the instituting of a collection, once at least every Sunday, in every congregation. The amount collected at a given time in many, perhaps in most, would be inconsiderable; but the annual aggregate would be very large—I had almost said, enormous. Suppose a weekly average of $3 in one thousand congregations, the aggregate sum per annum would be $156,000. Suppose it to be $5 per week, the annual aggregate would be $260,000. Now of this latter sum deduct one-third, $86,666 and a fraction, and appropriate it as a general fund for cheap church-building, and there would be $163,332, or thereabouts, an annual general fund for the support of a ministry to preach the Gospel to the poor in our large cities and in other destitute places; which at a salary of $800 per annum would enable the Church to employ some two hundred clergymen, trained to this specific work. I would have other contributions, in the shape of pew rents, special missionary and other collections, go on as heretofore. The weekly collection I would have made general, by a Canon of the General Convention. And the amount collected I would have paid over monthly to the Treasurer of the General Convention, or the Trustees associated with him—and have the Bishops of the several Dioceses send in an annual estimate of the sum required for their respective Dioceses, and the Treasurer or Trustees apportion the same according

to funds on hand and the estimated wants of the Diocese, and pay it quarterly to the Missionaries or clergy employed, in the order of their Dioceses. The fund for church-building, I would have employed as a loan to congregations desiring to erect a church, without interest—the vestry of each congregation being pledged to begin, on the receipt of the sum loaned, a sinking fund for its ultimate liquidation, by special collections monthly or quarterly. This is a mere outline of a plan which has suggested itself to my mind, for increasing the contributions of Churchmen, and providing specially for Church accommodation, free Church accommodation, and the support of a ministry for the poor, the middling classes, the general mass of the community. If I am not deceived in my arithmetic, the previous statement of results would meet all our immediate wants in the premises. The average I have adopted is the result of experience in three parishes of my own Diocese, in which the weekly collection for Church purposes has been introduced. We have heretofore, it appears to me, grasped too much at nuggets from given men and in given congregations, while we have neglected to gather the grains from the Church generally. We have aimed at great things and neglected little things, in our endeavours to obtain contributions from our people.

VI. "*Could changes be advantageously made in our Liturgical services?*"

I think no changes could be advantageously made, and none required, with one exception to be men-

tioned in the sequel: and I should seriously deprecate the attempt, either in the way of positive alteration of the substance, or the arrangement, or in abridgment, or in canonical permission to abbreviate, omit, adapt, or substitute, at the discretion of the officiating minister. That our Liturgical services, in their present form, do not constitute any material hindrance to the growth of the Church and its adaptation and acceptability with the mass of the people, seems to me evident, from the well ascertained fact, that that growth is, and manifestly has been, greatest, in those portions of the Church, in which those services are used in their integrity, without mutilation or abridgment. The community at large, it is true, are accustomed to a different and theoretically less restrained mode of worship: but is that a good reason for changing or assimilating our mode to theirs? The prevalent mode of worship in this country, among the outsiders who have to a large extent pre-occupied the ground, is manifestly an innovation on Apostolic and primitive usage, without any intrinsic feature to recommend it, and give it superiority over ours. Its imperfections and disadvantages, and they are many and great, are beginning to be felt by those who have heretofore been most strenuous in its advocacy, and most bitterly prejudiced against a prescribed form of prayer, even to the disuse of the Lord's Prayer. They are beginning to perceive the necessity of precomposed forms; and many of them are advocating the use of a Liturgy in public worship, and giving

weighty reasons therefor. Would it be wise in us, to say nothing of other considerations, to change or adapt our time-honoured Liturgical services, so as to approximate nearer to the objectionable mode of worship of these outsiders, just when they are perceiving the defects of extemporaneous services, and recommending a change to a mode more restricted and permanent? Rather is it not part of the Church's mission, at this crisis, to hold fast more steadfastly than ever to her form of sound words, and, by the influence of our example, endeavour to create a better taste, and bring back the community to a purer and more primitive mode of worship than that to which they are accustomed? The Liturgy of the Church is, moreover, a very important medium of the teaching of the Church—and the conservator of her doctrines, and of the "faith once delivered unto the saints." While we lift up our voices in praise and prayer, in her admirable forms of devotion, we are indoctrinated in the principles of our holy religion; and as we praise or pray, we learn "the truth as it is in Jesus." Thus the Liturgy is the conservative element in our ecclesiastical organization, and our edifying teacher; the element which preserves the faith we have received from Apostles and Martyrs, and find confirmed in our Bibles, in its integrity and purity, free from any admixture of error or heresy. Any change, any allowance of change in our Liturgical services, would abridge this teaching, might seriously vitiate it,

and impair if not destroy the stability of our holy faith.

But there is one exception, in which some little discretion might be allowed, not to the clergy generally, but to the Bishops under whose supervision they exercise their ministry. It is to meet an exigency of frequent occurrence in the strictly Missionary field, that of the introduction of our services among those who are wholly unaccustomed to them. There is, to say the least, an embarrassment in performing the full responsive service under such circumstances; and its edifying tendency, as well as its facilitating the great object of commending the Church to acceptance, is questionable. I would, therefore, respectfully suggest, as the result of some experience and observation in the Missionary field, and as a temporary measure only, that there be discretionary authority canonically given to the Bishop, or ecclesiastical authority, to allow, in such cases, an abridgment of the service, or an adaptation of the service, preserving the principle of a precomposed form, and using only the prayers and hymns of praise set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, dispensing with responses, until such time as the people, by instruction and drilling, are made acquainted with the Liturgy, and with the principles on which it is framed, and it is practicable to perform the full service.

The same allowance might be extended to Missionary efforts among the poor in our large cities, for the same reasons, and with the same limitation.

VII. "*Should the conditions on which ministers are admitted to orders, be prescribed exclusively by the General Convention?*"

I answer yes; and made as stringent as possible. There should be no relaxation of existing provisions. And in order to preserve unity, the rule should extend over all the confederated Dioceses. There would be danger of very great and serious disorders, if this matter of admission to the ministry of the Church was left discretionary with every Diocese. We would have half-fledged clergy in some Dioceses, who would be seeking and finding admission into other Dioceses where the regulations were stricter, and confusion, strife, and animosity engendered.

I do not precisely understand the bearing of this interrogatory. If it be to facilitate the admission of unlearned men to the ministry, when the Standing Committee of a particular Diocese may be overpersuaded to recommend, and the Bishop to ordain, my answer is as above. There should be a check on importunity, which is often attempted, and is sometimes successful, even now, to the serious injury of the Church, and to the character of her ministry.

VIII. "*Ought the conditions now imposed on candidates, who have been licensed or ordained in other Protestant Communions, be relaxed, &c., &c.?*"

By no means. I would have them increased in stringency; particularly as to the extension of the period of probation. My reasons for this reply, are fully set forth in a report of the Committee on Canons

to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the General Convention of 1841, written by me, though signed by the Chairman. The opinions therein expressed, I have seen no reason to change. They are my deliberate opinions now. To this report, which I have not time to copy, I beg leave respectfully to refer the Committee, as my reply to this interrogatory in all its branches.

There are some other interrogatories which I have left unnoticed, because I do not perceive their precise bearing. The Committee would, perhaps, be as little enlightened by my answers to them, did I understand them, as they may probably be by the answers I have ventured to give to the interrogatories already noticed. I have only to remark, that my replies are the result of careful thought and clear conviction, and must go for what they worth.

With great respect, and with earnest prayer that your deliberations may promote the best interests of the Church, I am, Right Reverend Brethren,

Truly and affectionately
Your friend and brother,
George Upfold.

January 13th, 1855.

BISHOP SCOTT'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Commission of the House of Bishops, Etc.

Right Reverend Brethren:—

It was my first intention not to attempt a reply to the Memorial and Questions appended, copies of which were received a short time since. But upon further reflection, it may be better to offer the few and confessedly imperfect suggestions which occur to me upon the general subject. I cannot take up the several questions propounded, nor discuss at length the points of the Memorial. Most of these require more of experience, observation, thought, and reading than falls to my lot. And I offer any suggestions to such a body, and upon such momentous questions, with unfeigned diffidence.

I am disposed, at the outset, to question the *assumption* upon which the Memorial proceeds: "That our Church, confined to the exercise of her present system, is not sufficient for the great purposes" of uniting

together all faithful Christians, and "of preaching and dispensing the Gospel to all sorts and conditions of men." I do not know precisely by what process of reasoning this conclusion is reached. That Christendom is sadly divided, and thereby dishonoured and weakened, is undeniably the fact. That iniquity abounds in every part of the world, and that myriads in nominally Christian lands are destitute as well of the saving knowledge as of the converting power of the Gospel, is undeniably true. That Christians, either individually or collectively, have done their bounden duty in making known to all men "the glorious gospel of the blessed God," or in striving to bring them "to the obedience of faith," no one will affirm. But what then? Does it follow from these facts that the "present system" of our Church is unadapted to the great ends of ecclesiastical organization?

To say that our system is imperfect, is a simple truism. Is any other system less so? Or were all existing systems combined, would that combination be a perfect system? The Bible presents to the world a perfect system of religion, and yet infidelity has room to taunt us with its failure to produce its design — to achieve its mission. In the nature of things, an ecclesiastical system is general in its provisions, and is, in itself, powerless; because it can reach nothing beyond the externals of religion. And yet the Church could not exist as an organized body of men without it. But if any one, whether clergy-

man or layman, should suppose that his duty consisted merely in executing the regulations of a system, however wisely constructed, he would betray a fatal ignorance as well of the first principles of religion, as of the design of all systems of organization. And herein I apprehend the present evil lies.

For if not, then it must be alleged that there is something in "our present system" which *hinders* the fulfilment of our mission on earth; "the work of preaching and dispensing the Gospel to all sorts and conditions of men." And this evidently is the gravamen of the Memorial. But can this be truly alleged? Is it true with regard to our own body? Who of us can say that he would have prayed more, and more faithfully—that he would have preached more, and more earnestly—that he would have gone out more frequently into the streets and lanes of the city, or the highways and hedges of the country to preach the Gospel to the poor—that he would more liberally have given of his substance to relieve the poor and needy, or to sustain the ministrations of religion at home, and send the Word of Life to all men—that he would more tenderly have loved all Christian people, and laboured to set forth quietness and peace among them? Who can say he would have done all this if the Canons and Rubrics had not forbidden him? If any man complain in this behalf, the Church may safely reply, "Ye are not straitened in us, but in your own bowels." To say nothing of the Bible, which is at least a part of "our present

system," let any one deliberately read over the exhortations delivered to both Priests and Bishops when solemnly set apart to these offices in the Church of God; and can he then suppose that the same Church has deliberately bound a system of external regulations upon our conscience which forbids us to discharge, to the extent of our ability, the duties and responsibilities so solemnly laid upon us? This we can hardly suppose.

But is it true that our clergy—those I mean who are earnest and faithful—are unsuccessful in their ministrations? or less successful than others who are not under our system? It was but recently that a distinguished Methodist preacher published a letter in which he avowed that the Parochial Clergy of England were doing the Lord's work more faithfully and successfully among all sorts and conditions of men, than those of the dissenting bodies around them. And more recently, the Congregational Divines of the same land avowed, in a public discussion, the necessity of adopting a Liturgy as a means of greater and more permanent success in their ministrations. All apparent success is not real, and we must look to that which is the product of truth, for that alone is safe and eternal.

I presume there are, both of the clergy and laity, some who so construe the system of the Church, and who so interpret her laws and traditions, that they do appear to contravene as well an expansive spirit of Christian charity, as a thorough compliance with the

very soul of our commission, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." But such cases are found in every Christian body, and under every system. I by no means think lightly of a conscientious compliance with the Canons and Rubrics of the Church. Far otherwise. Still it is possible for men to become in these matters what, in social intercourse, we call *sensitive*. And all I plead for is that this morbid rubricity shall not be taken as the true interpretation and scope of our system.

Asking your pardon if it shall seem presumptuous, and your patience if it seem futile, I will endeavour to illustrate my conception of this point. Perhaps it is fair to consider our charge and commission, as clergymen, under two aspects—one as we are ministers (literally) of the Church as an organized body; the other, as we are ambassadors for Christ to a world in rebellion. Now, for the best of reasons, the Church prescribes in what way her discipline and worship shall be conducted, so that all shall be for her peace and edification. This prescription is made with such limits and discretions as to adapt the whole to the occurring contingencies of all human affairs. But they all pertain to the Church as such, or to her individual members—for she cares for all, in every condition. And yet, fixed as all appears to be, and really is, there is a wide margin left after all to the discretion and zeal of the minister—as for instance in the departments of preaching, and parochial visiting.

But the question now arises, does the clergyman's

charge, as an ambassador for Christ, cease with the performance of this ministry in and for the Church? We are not asking now whether the faithful discharge of his pastoral care, in an ordinary congregation, be not enough for his heart, and head, and hands. We are looking for a principle. Is he not the ambassador for Christ to those who are without the Church—to pray them in his stead to be reconciled to God? Is he not bound to do good in this respect to all men, while he should care especially for those who are of the household of faith?

To this question it would seem a very general and decided answer has been given by all orders in the Church, and that answer has been generally acquiesced in. For example; while the Sunday School is confined principally to the children of a particular congregation, it may justly be regarded as an aid to the minister in his appropriate work of catechizing the children of his charge. This, however, does not prevent but that the same minister, assisted by such as are willing, may rent rooms in destitute places, and gather in such other children as would not come to the Church, or could not be there accommodated, and give them such religious instruction as their wants demand. And in these exercises, whether in the Parish Sunday School room, or in any other place, it is considered not only allowable, but proper, that other forms of worship be adopted than the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer. And this proceeds upon the obvious principle that we are preparing these

children to become intelligent and devout worshippers in the Church.

Now if this course be consistent with our system, how is it not equally so for a clergyman to adopt similar means of reaching the untaught and godless adults around him? This course is constantly pursued in our foreign missions, and these grown-up neglecters of God in Christian lands, do not differ so widely from children or heathens but that the same course becomes necessary in their case. They must be taught and interested in religion before they can become worshippers in any form. If we can but lead them, "by the word of truth, by the Holy Ghost," to a sense of their sin, and of their duty, they will spontaneously become worshippers of God "in spirit and in truth." Look at St. Paul upon Mars Hill—where is any evidence that he preceded that sermon by the regular form of worship used in Christian assemblies, or by any worship at all?

I am not content to ask merely whether the Canons and Rubrics, rightly understood, prevent such a course; I ask, whether it be not an integral part of his solemn commission and duty as an ambassador for Christ? For the manner in which he uses this trust, every clergyman is, undoubtedly, accountable to the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese; and it is the duty of his Bishop to see that he use not this liberty for a cloak.

I am sure, Right Reverend Fathers and Brethren, you will not mistake the purport of this reasoning, as

if I were disparaging the Prayer Book, or the place it holds in the worship of the Church; or the value of a settled ministry. These are not the questions in debate. Sincerely believing that our system gives ample scope for the discharge of every duty—for "making full proof of our ministry"—I have sought to vindicate it from this apparent misapprehension; for I do not see what alteration could materially better its adaptation.

If any alteration, however, of our Liturgical arrangements should be deemed necessary for its better adaptation to a strictly missionary work, I should then make this suggestion: the Book of Common Prayer remaining what it is, or what the General Convention shall see proper to make it, as the established form of worship for the Church, let it be submitted to the judgment of each Bishop, with the advice of his standing committee, to authorize such modified use of the service as the necessities of his Diocese may demand. Even this would be but a partial return to primitive usage, when each Diocese had its own *use*. There are undoubtedly great advantages resulting to the Church from a general uniformity in worship; but if that uniformity be so minute and fixed as to refuse adaptation to the actual condition and wants of Christian men, or to restrain in any degree the preaching of the Gospel to every creature, then it becomes a yoke of bondage, and a damage to Christ's kingdom. We surely need not to apply a more rigid law of interpretation in this case than our

Lord applied to one of the precepts of the Decalogue: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." The cases are sufficiently analogous.

The other leading point presented in the Memorial refers to the increase of ministerial agency, and the uniting in closer bonds of those already employed in different Christian bodies. With reference to the first, so far as it relates to clergymen, I do not very well see how our existing Canons could be much enlarged. It should certainly be regarded as desirable, if not indispensable, that Bishops and Presbyters be educated men, and therefore we have made that the general rule. At the same time provision is made for ordaining all, as well to the Priesthood as the Diaconate, who have even the lowest grade of preparation with which we could desire to see any one admitted to the ministry. Whether this latter class have been sufficiently encouraged to enter into orders is a different question. Nor can there be a question that many of that class would be much more useful men than scores of those who are classically educated. Where to stop between our present Canons, and the indiscriminate licensing or ordaining every one who wishes to preach, I do not clearly see. I believe the two large religious bodies in this country who have carried out this scheme, are becoming wearied and disgusted with it, and well they may be so. If any body could venture on such a course, the Church could, with the tempering influence of her Prayer Book. But this I presume no one desires.

The suggestion for uniting the Protestant denominations, or increasing our ministry, by ordaining those who at the same time decline to unite cordially with us in the general system of discipline and worship, seems to me entirely inadmissible. There is but one way of admitting it, and that is by abolishing entirely our rule of Liturgical service. The objection does not lie in the minds of our non-Episcopal brethren, against *our* Prayer Book, but against the use of all written forms of public prayer. Now what would be gained by the admission of such persons to our ministry? Would there be any more of real unity then than now? Would not the strife and division be rather increased, as contests within the household are always more implacable than those among strangers? If our brethren stood apart simply on account of our mode of worship, I would consent to any modification of it which piety and good sense might demand. For I am well assured that if the rejection of the Liturgy were not a ground upon which *denominational existence* is staked (and must, therefore, be maintained), a very large proportion of the intelligent and pious of all denominations would unite in the use of it. To reach a consummation so devoutly to be wished as the reunion of all who hold the substance of the true faith, I would consent, reluctantly it may be, to any considerable liberty in this matter. For instance, that a clergyman might close the services by using an extemporary prayer, or one of his own composition, after sermon; or that one service in the day might

be conducted without the use of the Liturgy. I do not say that I desire this alteration; but I would concede it for such an object. Having been brought up without any knowledge of Liturgical worship, and accustomed for thirteen years to officiate without it in public, I ought to feel the cramp and hindrance of the Liturgy if there be any. This, however, is yet to be discovered; and I would not consent, on any ground, to abolish the use of the Prayer Book.

It is useless, however, to discuss this point further. I am not aware of any desire, on the part of any considerable number of non-Episcopalians, to receive ordination at our hands; and in all those cases where such a desire arises from conscientious convictions, there is no hindrance found in the required conformity. A number of the points to which the Puritans objected in England, have either been removed or made discretionary in the Church in this country; but has that conciliated the objectors? Not only so, but the bodies which then dissented and separated have abandoned or modified the original principles upon which the separation was founded, receding still farther at every step.

You may ask, then, is there no remedy for these crying wants — for these confessedly great evils? Must things continue as they are? Let us carefully distinguish between what belongs to us, and what to God. The Church, in every age, has made her most egregious blunders in attempting to do, by her own wisdom, what God will do by His own Spirit of Truth.

You need no illustration of this. What then is the remedy? It is to be sought alone in the grace—the abounding grace of the New Covenant—in the presence and mighty working of the Holy Ghost. Do we need more labourers in the harvest? He alone can call and send them. Is our ministry inefficient, or fruitless? So it will continue, until pervaded and accompanied by the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven. Is the Church weakened and disgraced by strife and schism? It is because professed Christians "are carnal and walk as men"—and will so continue until "all by one spirit are baptized into one body, and made to drink into one spirit." When the true Pentecostal Spirit shall descend upon the Church General as at the first, Christian men will no longer deify their own opinions, or themselves, but Christ will be all, and all shall be one in Him, as He and the Father are one.

But it may be asked, Have we not something to do, as workers together with God, to bring about this blessed result? Assuredly, much. Repentance—confession—prayer without ceasing—"to be instant in season, out of season, in preaching the word, reproving, rebuking, exhorting with all long-suffering and patience." In all this we must look simply to the truth as it is in Jesus, in all its relations. If in anything we have unduly magnified what is indifferent, we should relax it simply for Christ and the truth's sake. If we have contended, even for the truth, in an ungentle or uncharitable spirit, this must be

exchanged for the meekness and gentleness of Christ. And then, when we have done all this, we may commit all in the confidence of faith to Him whose "is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory." He will, in His own time, bring light out of darkness and order out of confusion.

There are several points raised in your questions appended to the Memorial which deserve serious attention. Most of those pertaining to the modification of our discipline and worship have been well propounded in the paper issued by the recent meeting of Convocation in England. For example, the necessity of employing an itinerant ministry wherever there are destitute regions of country, or many feeble congregations. There is manifestly no other way of preaching the Gospel to all people. And yet the suggestion that these are to extend their mission into the parishes of settled ministers, is liable to most serious abuse. This was pretty thoroughly tried a few years back in several religious denominations, in the form of Evangelists and revival preachers. Its fruit is the only commentary needed. Itinerants are a necessary but temporary expedient, to supply the lack of stated ministers, and to prepare the way for them. They should be regarded in no other light.

Brethren, I crave your indulgence for having thus freely expressed my individual views upon some of the important matters committed to your consideration. I pray God to preside over your deliberations, by His Holy Spirit, and to conduct you to such con-

clusions as may be for His glory in the extension of His Kingdom, and the salvation of men.

Very sincerely,

Your servant and brother,

THOMAS F. SCOTT.

Nov. 24, 1854.

REV. DR. BOWMAN'S COMMUNICATION.

Right Reverend and Dear Sir:

My thoughts on the subject of "the Memorial" will, I fear, profit you little. But such as they are, they are quite at your service. In the general scope and aim of the Memorial I heartily concur. Of the details which it dimly suggests, I can say nothing; for I do not understand precisely what the memorialists mean.

My thoughts may properly range themselves under two heads. 1st. The changes in our Liturgical Forms and worship that may be expedient. And 2d. The best method of working a parish, with a view to the end proposed, and in points not prescribed by authority.

As to the first, it seems to me, that one great point with the memorialists, is gained by the new Canon in regard to admission to the Diaconate. I should think they can hardly desire a wider door of entrance than

that. To me it seems to meet the exigency in that direction fully.

Next as to our Liturgical Forms. (Of course it is not intended to touch doctrines.) Our Afternoon Service, I think, requires no change. It is brief, simple, and full. I do not see how it could be improved.

As to our Morning Service, however, I have no objection to change; except the fear I have of all changes in things long established. Apart from this, I should be glad to see it shortened in length, and simplified in form. The most obvious mode of shortening, will be the omission of the ante-Communion office. Notoriously, Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion office, were distinct services originally. By running them together, we have increased them to an inconvenient length, and destroyed the beautiful simplicity and unity by which they are separately characterized. Why not have the Communion Service, as it now stands—perhaps with some brief introduction, to take off the feeling of abruptness—to be used alone when the Sacrament is actually administered? With this change, the remainder of our Morning Service would perhaps be sufficiently simple, and not too long; though it might be considered whether it is expedient to pray for the same objects in the Morning Prayer, and again in the Litany, as ex. gr. for our rulers and for the clergy.

Every special occasion also—as Ordination, Confirmation, Consecration, &c., &c.—should have a separate and distinct office, and not be complicated

and lengthened as it now is, by being dove-tailed into the regular Morning or Evening Service. As things now are, it is almost impossible to keep up the spirit of devotion through these long and involved services.

The Memorial does not *say*, but I suppose it *means*, that there should be a liberty in regard to extempore prayers. And provided the opening services are prescribed by authority, I see no unanswerable objection to allowing a freedom in the pulpit, if brethren desire it. It is idle to say men are not competent. The same argument would drive them from the pulpit altogether. If a clergyman himself desires it, and his people desire it, I say let him use his gift. My greatest objection to it has always been, that it was unauthorized by law. The "Eikon Basilike" yields this point unreservedly. On other occasions—as funerals, meetings of societies, and the like—for which the Church makes no provision, let every man do the best he can. I have never considered myself at all bound by the Prayer Book, when I found myself in a position for which evidently the Prayer Book had not provided. In all such emergencies, I feel myself as free as a Methodist or a Presbyterian.

With these changes, it seems to me, we shall have done all that is desirable in the way of Liturgical changes. Some of these, probably, were not in the contemplation of the Memorialists.

Next, as to what I call the *working of the parish*. I think as much quite is to be hoped from changes here, as from alterations in our Liturgical forms.

But as this does not touch the business of the Memorial directly, I don't know why I should trouble you with my thoughts upon it. I will, however, be brief.

In all our large towns and cities we should have free Churches; not all of that character, but enough for the exigency; not for the poor, but where rich and poor shall meet together, on a footing of substantial equality—at least so far as the worship of God is concerned.

Our clergy must learn to preach without writing. I know the objections that scholars and rhetoricians will urge against the extempore method. But the world is not made up of scholars and rhetoricians. For the mind of the masses, with all its crudities and repetitions, the extempore method is undoubtedly the best. In an age which lays such stress on preaching, the importance of this is hardly to be over-estimated; especially when Christianity is to assume an aggressive character, and attack ignorance and vice in their own strongholds.

We must draw the Laity in to our assistance, to a much greater extent than has been usual. Many parts of the work, now left wholly in the hands of the minister, could be as well, perhaps better done, by an earnest-minded Layman. Without at all intruding into the province of the clergy, they may render the most valuable assistance, in the way of exploring, drawing men out to worship, counselling, encouraging those who of all things need most a word of advice and sympathy. By availing themselves largely of

lay co-operation, the Methodists increase many-fold their working power, and at the same time draw men to their Communion, by that natural feeling of gratification which all men find in seeing their services valued and called for. Certainly, caution is necessary here: but where is it not necessary?

I have a scheme of a brotherhood for my parish floating in my thoughts; somewhat more extensive in its range than any I have seen; i. e. I wish to make its benefits available to all without reference to age or health, or ability to contribute. The contributions of those who will never draw from it, may be made, I hope, to provide for those who can contribute little or nothing.

But I grow tedious. I will briefly mention what we are doing at the new Church, and then release you. There is the Sunday School, with above one hundred children, twenty or thirty of them German—speaking no English—Romanists and Protestants. But we have teachers who speak German. Then, through the week, Mr. Coit has his school, of about forty boys, in the basement of the Church. On Wednesday evening we have an excellent teacher of sacred music, whose instructions all are free to attend. On every other evening in the week, except Saturday, in the same place, a class of adults come to be taught to read and write. This week, on Saturday, the girls of the neighbourhood are to be assembled to be taught the use of the needle; and of course we shall take the opportunity to teach them something else. I am

about to attempt what may be called cottage lectures; i. e. to go of an evening to the houses of those poor people, where three, four, or six of the neighbours may be called in, and have some little but edifying service among those who have but seldom been seen in the house of God. Out of these small beginnings something valuable may come. It is truly a day of small things with us yet. If we succeed in our work, it will be, under God, more owing to the zealous efforts of devout women, than to almost any other single cause. Pardon this interminable epistle. You will never be so rash as to ask my opinion again.

Truly your friend and brother,

S. Bowman.

June 19th, 1854.

DR. COXE'S COMMUNICATION.

The Right Reverend the Bishop of Pennsylvania, &c.

Right Reverend and Dear Sir:—

It affords me pleasure to comply with the request you do me the honour to make, and to condense the substance of my letter to Bishop Otey, into a short outline view. I am glad that you propose to collect different views upon the important subject now rising into practical consequence in the Church, and the more so, because, though deeply impressed with my own conclusions in the premises, I am sure that one-sided measures are neither wise nor practicable.

The object of my letter to the Chairman of the late Commission, was to urge the necessity of the perpetuation of such a Commission, with a view to Christian unity and Liturgical adaptation; and also, to explain the position of the "Postscribers," as differing from the Memorialists. It certainly affords me no small satisfaction to find the measures actually

adopted at the late General Convention, coincident in spirit, if not in detail, with those which I had endeavoured to promote; the Commission on Church Unity, and the two committees of your Right Reverend House (that on concert with the Churches of England and Scotland in Liturgical matters, and that on the expediency of future intercourse with Sweden), covering the entire ground, so far as it might be well to advance at present.

Waiving the subject of the standard Bible, in connexion with which the dangerous innovations of popular editions were pointed out; in the matter of the Prayer Book, a similar solicitude was expressed that it might be left untouched. As a substitute for various suggestions of the "Memorialists" and others, I ventured to propose the compilation of a Primer, after the example of the Primers of the Reformers, which should meet the exigencies of our situation, in such a way as to disturb nothing at present established. The more I think of it, the more am I persuaded that this idea, matured and carried out by abler hands, may be made acceptable to nearly "all sorts and conditions of men" in our Anglo-American Church.

The subject of a revised Hymnal was presented as one for which there is a strong and increasing demand, and from which none of those considerations which affect every conservative mind, with reference to the Prayer Book, operate to dissuade us. The labours of Bishop Heber, and others, in this direction, came

too late to be felt in the work of 1832; and since then, the elevated standard of taste, and the growing sense of ritual propriety, as well as the valuable additions which have been made to devotional literature in general, have been calling, more and more loudly, for a revision of that useful, but imperfect work.

In this connection was introduced the interesting subject of the position of the Moravian and other Christians, *presumptively* Apostolic in their Orders and ritual; and while the value of a standing Commission on Church Unity was argued, it was suggested that the hope of finally including such Christians in the unity of the Church's discipline, might be greatly strengthened by the incorporation of some of their favourite hymns with ours, and by including the unobjectionable portions of their Liturgies in the proposed Primer. When I reflect on the vast concessions which even Saint Gregory, the Roman patriarch of the sixth century, was willing to make to the Church of the Britons, in order to unite them with his own, in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, I cannot think we should be more stiff than he was, as to terms of communion with any orthodox Christians of our own country, who might be joined with us in the holy efforts of evangelization, so imperatively demanded by the peculiar necessities of this immense country, and by its appalling religious destitution.

Not to dwell on other details which have been amply provided for, by the action of the Bishops in

the late Convention, and hazarding no expression of opinion as to the steps which provoked some difference of opinion between the members of the Lower House, I close this communication by referring any, who may be further interested in its suggestions, to the letter itself, as published in the "Church Review" of last October. Its drift was, in short, to present a medium course between extremes, and, if possible, to unite the great body of Churchmen in a plan of healthful progress, under the restraints of a sober conservatism; thus meeting the wants of *millions* now external to the Church's unity, while sacrificing not a jot or tittle of what is justly dear to the *thousands* whom it already includes, and whose spiritual wants it entirely satisfies.

May I conclude by expressing the belief that the Prayer Book has nothing to fear from the liturgical inquiries likely to be stimulated by the pressure of this movement among us. The more we examine it, the more we shall love it, and the more jealous shall we be of its old landmarks which our fathers have set. It is evident that a reaction is already begun in England, where great works such as that of Mr. Freeman, are correcting the spiritual mawkishness and dyspepsia engendered by the writers who killed the "British Critic." For the next three years Liturgical studies will be a great feature of the times; and should the mass of thinkers in our Church, at the end of that period, find themselves up to the work exhibited by a writer in the Mercersburg Re-

view (said to be an eminent Presbyterian), it is evident that we shall be in no danger from rash and innovating legislation.

I remain, Right Reverend and Dear Sir,
With sincere and filial regard,
Your faithful friend and servant,
A. CLEVELAND COXE.

December 12, 1856.

DR. CRAIK'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Rt. Rev. James H. Otey, D. D., Chairman of the Committee on the Memorial of Dr. Muhlenberg and others.

Right Reverend and Dear Sir:—

Having received at several times a printed copy of the questions proposed by the Committee of Bishops on "The Memorial," &c., I have thought that you might not consider it too presumptuous in me to make a few brief answers to some of the questions. I therefore respectfully lay before you those answers in the accompanying printed slip.

In confirmation of one of the views therein presented, permit me to add, that the Bishop in his See—Cathedra—is the prominent feature in the external aspect of the Church as left to us by the Apostles. The Bishop thus derived his living principally from the central Church, and exercised a real pastoral care over the whole people of the contiguous country, which formed his Diocese: the Presbyters and Deacons being his assistants.

Nearly the whole Church has sanctioned the wisdom of this seemingly Apostolic arrangement by imitating it. The refusal of the Church in the United States to imitate it has sanctioned its wisdom in another way, by our comparative failure to do the work of the Church in this country. The English Church attempts to supply the want of a sufficient number of Bishops by the expedient of Archdeacons, clothed with a sort of semi-episcopal authority. The Methodists in this country accomplish many valuable ends of the Episcopate by their contrivance of Presiding Elders, who constitute the most potent arm of that skilfully ordered society.

I trust that the authorities of the Church will not permit the present movement to pass without grasping effectually with the important subject of the wasted energy and power of the women of the Church.

With profound respect, your friend and obedient servant,

JAMES CRAIK.

Dec. 7, 1856.

A FEW BRIEF SUGGESTIONS, IN ANSWER TO SOME OF THE QUESTIONS PROPOSED BY THE COMMISSION OF BISHOPS ON THE MEMORIAL.

Only such of these questions are here considered as come within the range of the personal experience of the writer. The attempt at extreme conciseness gives an appearance of harsh abruptness to the answers, which the writer trusts will be pardoned for the sake

of so important a result as brevity in regard to a subject about which so much has already been written.

Class I.

Question 1. *The practical efficiency of Ministers.* *Answer.*—Let all candidates be taught to read English. The only certain mode of correcting vicious modes of reading is, to employ the services of some one who can give to the student an *accurate rehearsal* of his own performances. After many repetitions of this discipline, the young man will begin to detect the similar vice in his own tones, and then only will it be possible for him to correct it. It is lamentable to see men of cleverness making themselves and our glorious Liturgy a cause of pain to some, and of laughter to others, for the lack of this most essential element of education.

4. *Itinerating Ministers.* *Answer.*—While the proportion of our ministry to the population is so small, all our stations, out of the cities, should combine in some degree the itinerant with the parochial system. Almost every village in the land will afford a small Episcopal congregation on the first proposal. But the congregation in most of these places will not be self-supporting in twenty years. The burden of a "settled pastor" is too great for the people. The work to be done is too small for the minister. To set the poor man to school-keeping for a living, only makes the death of the enterprise a more lingering and painful one. But three, four, or five of such sta-

tions will be self-supporting at once—full of hope, life, and vigour. The writer presents here the results of a large and accumulated experience.

Our "itinerating evangelists" should be the Bishops. Our Church will not begin to fulfil her mission in this country until the dioceses are small enough to enable the Bishop to give half his time to the cathedral, or parish church, from which he derives a part of his support; and to make a full and satisfactory visitation of the whole of the Diocese in the remaining six months.

7. *Answer.*—If our churches in large towns are opened more frequently, it must be by an additional force of ministers. All the active ministers work harder now than they ought, in justice to themselves and to the Church.

9, 10, 11, 12. *Lay co-operation. Answer.*—Encourage brotherhoods and similar associations. Imitate, with a reasonable adaptation to circumstances, the Church of the Advent in Boston, and the Church of the Holy Communion in New York.

CLASS II.

Question 1. *The Liturgy. Answer.*—Saying the Litany in connexion with the Morning Prayer, is the feature of our service that makes it oppressive and distasteful to that large part of every congregation who do not take delight in prayer.

The beauty, variety, rapid transition, and completeness of the Morning Prayer, and the ante-Communion

service, would make them attractive, even where combined, to any miscellaneous congregation. To add on the Litany, beautiful as it is, is to convert pleasure and satisfaction into pain and weariness in the case of all but the more devout. Allow the Litany to be said *before* Morning Prayer, by the *praying* part of the congregation, assembled for that purpose, and all difficulty will be removed. The ante-Communion is the *special* Sunday service, and should never be omitted on that day.

What is wanted in purely Missionary services is, just that which all efficient missionaries already have —common sense and loyalty to the Church. Use as much of the Liturgy as circumstances will allow, and at every transition in the service, tell the people what you are going to do, and the reason of it, and ask their active help. They will join you with more uniformity than many city congregations, and they will use the whole Morning Prayer and ante-Communion, omitting the Litany, not only without weariness, but with expressions of unalloyed gratification. I have tried this very often, and it always succeeded in winning the people.

To curtail the musical part of the service will be a long step backwards. This is the feature which is most attractive to those who are without, and whom we should seek to win. I should be glad to see the Metre Psalms, as a collection, abolished; and the few that are good incorporated into the collection of hymns.

2, 3. *Opening the door to the Ministry. Answer.*— It is wide enough, and without more strictness on the part of our authorities, too wide already. All the difficulties that are so much talked about in the way of the efficiency of our Church, are as nothing in comparison with that fatal prominent one—*the house divided against itself.* The large majority of our ministers, of all parties—if there is more than one party in the Church—faithfully preach the Gospel, as the Church received it. But there is distributed about through the mass a small number who coarsely denounce that preaching as "a soul-destroying lie." The teaching of the Gospel is thus effectually thwarted, and the power of the Church over public opinion completely destroyed. Men will not seriously inquire into that which is thus resolved into the mere peculiarities of an odious party. They are too glad of so good an excuse to shrink from inquiry, and to retain their old opinions.

If the Church could speak with one consenting voice throughout this land, men, bewildered and divided as they are, would be compelled to hear and heed her. Her moral and persuasive and healing power would then be invincible: her progress would then be rapid enough to satisfy the most ardent and enthusiastic. But, alas! when men are ordained to her ministry, clothed with her authority, and seated in her high places, who cannot conscientiously say her Catechism for children, and whose work of love it is to revile her doctrines, her institutions, and her faith-

ful people, her enemies rejoice, and the world looks on with comfortable self-complacency.

Until these men are repelled from the ministry of the Church, and permitted to go to the denominations they love so dearly, and fancy to be so pure, our Zion will not be as a city that is at unity in itself, and cannot therefore expect the prosperity that is promised to such unity. No legislation can galvanize a divided Church into adequate efficiency. With what proper motive these gentlemen seek admission into a Church in which they do not believe, and into a communion which they declare to be corrupt, it is hard to see.

The faithful men must do the best they can with things as they are, and wait upon God, and strive diligently for such measure of success as our actual condition will allow. I conclude, therefore, these brief suggestions with an expression of the speculative opinion, that the multiplication of FREE CHURCHES, and the encouragement of such associations of females as have recently been established in Germany and in England, will tend greatly to aid the Church in her mission.

REV. DR. CROSWELL'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Right Reverend Bishops Otey, Doane, A. Potter, Burgess, and Williams.

I have recently received a printed circular, purporting to be from the "Commission of Bishops appointed to consider the Memorial of the Rev. Dr. Muhlenberg and others;" to which two classes of questions are appended, with a suggestion that "Answers in writing, addressed to any member of the Commission, will be thankfully received." At my time of life, and at a period when my connexion with the Church on earth must necessarily be drawing to a close, it might, perhaps, better become me to keep silence on the topics here presented. But if, from my long experience, I may be able to add anything to the stock of information which the Commission may draw from other and more competent sources, I could hardly justify myself in withholding the few suggestions that follow.

I remain, Right Reverend Fathers,
with the highest respect and veneration,
your servant in the Gospel,
Harry Croswell.

March, 1855.

Class I.

Question 1. I am not sure that any special improvement could be made in the present method of training young men for the ministry, "in respect to learning, piety, intellectual power, or practical efficiency." I have been led to believe, however, from long observation, that if candidates for the ministry could be persuaded or required to spend a portion of their probationary period, say one year, under the immediate supervision of some efficient parish clergyman, it might conduce very much to their practical usefulness. It would afford them an opportunity of becoming familiar with the everyday working duties of the ministry. They might take an active part as catechists or superintendents of the Sunday Schools. They might accompany the clergyman in his pastoral visits to the sick, and on other special duties. They might officiate as lay-readers, when called upon for the purpose, and especially at extra lectures. They might be employed as almoners to the rector, and thus be brought into an immediate acquaintance with the wants of the poor and destitute. I have observed, and I presume that every member of the Commission may also have observed, that young men who have received at least a portion of their training in this way, have often made more efficient parish clergymen than those whose seclusion from the world, in schools and seminaries, has kept them in ignorance of many of the leading traits in the human character, and of the spiritual wants of the masses.

2. It is difficult to say what *is* "the prevalent character of our preaching." It is probably as various as the tastes and dispositions of men. But, so far as my observation enables me to judge, I apprehend there is a *prevalent defect* in the character of our preaching. The Church, as a permanent institution of God—as a sacramental Church—is not so often brought into view, as its interests, and the interests of religion, demand. And our people, in many cases, are suffered to forget that the Church is distinguished from other religious communities, except in its forms of worship, and in its mode of ordination. The modes of instruction, besides sermons from the pulpit, which I have "found specially beneficial and effective," will furnish an answer to

3. Besides a thorough system of parochial visitation to the well, no less than the sick, the poor and the needy—and the personal distribution of alms and private charities, as well as Prayer Books, tracts, and other books of instruction—I have adopted several modes of extraparochial services; such as evening lectures, in school-houses and lecture-rooms; catechetical and Bible classes, and Bible lectures; and more especially "pastoral visits," held at private houses in different parts of the parish, where the neighbours have been invited to attend, and where the exercises consist of prayer, and praise, and familiar instruction on some Scriptural Lesson. In this way, many have doubtless been led to receive the Gospel who might otherwise have remained in heathen ignorance, within sight of our consecrated and well-sustained Churches.

4. "Permanent deacons" may doubtless be advantageously employed in parishes which can provide suitable support for them; and there may be cases where a portion of the clergy may devote their time to private or other instruction, without any neglect of the spirit of their ordination vows. But I can conceive no benefit to be derived from "itinerating Evangelists," within the limits of organized parishes. Such men would almost necessarily interfere with the regular duties of the parish clergyman, dividing the responsibility with him, but seldom or never rendering him any valuable assistance.

5. Doubtless the Church may be edified, and "ministers, thrown out of parish life, may yet be advantageously occupied," in various ways. For example, as professors and teachers in institutions of learning—in seminaries, academies, and select schools—in superintending periodicals and other works—and in any employ which has for its object the promotion and inculcation of religious truth.

6. I am not aware of any defects in the matters here enumerated.

7. It is probable that much benefit might be derived from such arrangements as are here suggested, and more especially if better provision were thereby made for more *frequent Communion*. But, except in Churches where the *sittings are free*, it might be extremely difficult to settle any arrangement that might not disturb the claims or rights of pew-holders.

8. The appointment of Bible and Confirmation classes.

9. Within the limits of my own observation, I am not aware of any lack of this co-operation.

10. By the teaching and example of the pastors.

11 & 12. Doubtless an almost universal answer to these questions would be, "Give the young and the worldly men among us more attractive preaching." This is all very well; but I think the evil lies too deep to be cured by preaching alone, be it never so attractive. The sensual heart can be thoroughly probed, only through the efficacy of prayer. The Church, collectively, does not pray enough. It is true that she has made ample provision for prayer, both public and private. By a daily service, and by full offices for the festivals and fasts, and for the holy days of the year, she has invited her people to "pray always." But so long as this provision is in a great measure neglected; so long as her ministers, and those who profess to be Christians, take no special interest in these services; how can it be expected that the thoughtless youth and the worldly man can imbibe the spirit of religion? Let the Church and her ministers show that they *are in earnest* in desiring the salvation of souls, and, I doubt not, they will kindle up a sympathy among all ranks and conditions of men, sufficient to fill our churches with young men, and to exercise a saving influence over the minds of those hitherto engrossed in business.

13. Much can be done towards promoting these

objects, by frequent earnest appeals to the people. But in no way, it appears to me, can we secure a steady and reliable income to the fund for the Missionary enterprises of the Church, without establishing in our several parishes a stated and regular period, say monthly, for collecting the free-will offerings of the people. This opinion is founded on experience and observation.

Class II.

Question 1. After an experience of more than forty years, in one of the largest parishes in the country, and after the most serious reflection on the subject, I feel constrained to say, that I should be sorry to see any material changes in our Liturgical services.

(a.) The morning service, including the sermon, seldom exceeds an hour and a half; which cannot be deemed unreasonable as to time, or too laborious for the officiating minister. To lengthen it would hardly be found expedient, inasmuch as it seems already to embrace everything necessary for a worshipping congregation. A division of the morning service, on Communion Days, might be admissible in large and compact parishes; but, under other circumstances, it would subject the worshippers to great inconvenience.

(b.) It has always appeared to me that the tables of Lessons, as well for the daily service as for Sundays and holy days, might be improved by an entire re-casting of the whole; and that, in the new arrangement, it might be well to substitute Lessons from the

canonical Scriptures, for those from the Apocryphal Books.

(c.) It appears to me that, if a larger number of special prayers, &c., be added, it should be done with great caution. The Litany is sufficiently minute to reach almost all special cases; and, beyond this, comprehensiveness seems most desirable.

(d.) A larger discretion might, doubtless, be allowed in the use of hymns and other acts of praise. Appropriate anthems might be advantageously introduced, especially on festive or special occasions, and portions of the Psalter might be substituted for the metre version of the Psalms, at the discretion of the minister.

(e.) In Missionary work, both at home and abroad, suitable discretion might be allowed in the abridgment of, or selections from, the Liturgy.

(f.) I can perceive no good reason for enlarging the liberty already allowed to Diocesan authorities.

2. Any change in this respect, might endanger the harmony of the Church.

3. I can see no good reason for releasing the conditions now imposed on candidates, who have been licensed or ordained in other Protestant Communions.

(a.) As to term of time; having been, for some thirty years or more, a member of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Connecticut, I have had a pretty good opportunity of observing the practical working of the rules of the Church, with regard to candidates of this description. The applications for

admission have been very frequent, amounting in all to a great number; consisting of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Independents, Methodists, and Baptists. In a large majority of cases, the applicants were unwilling to submit to any probation as to time, and were rejected. These men, without an exception, were ascertained to be mere drones or idlers, restless, contentious, and quarrelsome, and desirous of a change only with the hope of improving their condition. But, on the other hand, the applicants who sought the orders of the Church from honest conviction, and were zealous and devoted men, have cheerfully submitted to the requirements of the Church, and have taken rank among the most active, efficient, and useful of our ministers.

(b.) Among the latter class of applicants, no objection, so far as I know, was ever made to the worship or discipline of the Church.

4. I know of no facts indicating any such preference, except on the ground of full conformity to all the rules, regulations, worship, and discipline of the Church.

5. I know of no facts indicating any such disposition, for the sake of unity. The spirit of unity does not generally constitute an element of sectarian bodies.

6. I do not feel competent to answer, nor do I deem it of much consequence.

7 and 8. Questions of expediency well worthy of consideration.

REV. DR. FULLER'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Commission of Bishops.

Right Reverend Fathers:

Having with some attention considered a portion of the inquiries contained in your circular, I will venture to reply as briefly as possible.

Class I.

Question 4. Could ministers under the direction of the Bishop of each Diocese visit such portions of it as are destitute of our ministrations, great good would follow, provided their labours were succeeded by a permanent settlement of other clergymen. But the Evangelists we most need are *Bishops themselves*, so that they may be the *pioneers* of the Gospel, in all our new states and territories, and throughout the world.

6. Could our present Catechism be enlarged by appending the doctrinal teaching of our articles and offices, material would thus be furnished for the instruction of that class of the young who now so

often consider themselves too old for the ordinary training of the Sunday School.

11.—Discourses to young men, were such addresses delivered at fixed periods in the course of each year, would, we may hope, attract their attention, and draw them in larger numbers to our Churches.

Were the clergy at all times, moreover, accustomed to press upon the young their baptismal obligations, our youth would not so frequently desert our places of worship.

Class II.

Question 1.—(b.) Were the Lessons for Holy Days taken *exclusively* from the Canonical Scriptures, those days would be much more generally observed. Lessons are also much needed for Ember Days and Missionary occasions. Were the Anthems at the end of the Selections of Psalms utterly rejected, three advantages at least would accrue. (1.) The proper Psalms could then *always* be used; which they cannot now be, when the Anthems are: (2.) Their places could be supplied with *new* Anthems compiled principally from the *New* Testament, after the model of our Easter Anthems: and (3.) Anthems could be provided, not merely as at present for Christmas, Ash-Wednesday, Good Friday, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday, but also for *Advent*, *Epiphany*, *Lent*, *Easter Eve*, *Trinity Sunday*, and the *Rogation and Ember Days*—thus imparting to these seasons increased significance and impressiveness, particularly to the two last.

(c.) Were this petition inserted in our Litany as

the very *first* supplication, "We sinners do beseech thee to hear us, O Lord God; and that it may please thee, O Thou Lord of the harvest, to send forth labourers into thy harvest," we should obey his express command, which our Prayer Book now so entirely neglects.

We need likewise to have our whole Book of Common Prayer more fully adapted to *individual and private* use. For instance: The adult candidate for Baptism, is to be "exhorted to prepare himself *with prayers* and fasting for the receiving of this holy sacrament," and yet we do not provide him suitable prayers. Let, then, brief prayers, compiled from the offices and Catechism, be appended to each; and our people would soon more clearly perceive that our Prayer Book was a manual not only for the Church, but for the closet. Clergymen, and some of the laity, can adapt the collects and other prayers to their own personal wants; but the great majority of individuals cannot, and therefore the work should be done for them.

A measureless amount of good might be accomplished, if, in addition to the *large* increase of the number of our Bishops, a system of *book-hawking* was extensively and efficiently practised. Thousands and tens of thousands of our reading population are as ignorant of our Book of Common Prayer, as they are of the Koran or the Shasters. While we are the only Protestants who have their devotions as well as their doctrines embodied in a book, how active and

diligent ought we to be in circulating this book among the multitudes who are constantly falling away to the abounding forms of error!

I have thus with no little diffidence attempted to answer some of the inquiries contained in your circular. I might perhaps reply to still other questions, but presuming that I should only repeat opinions so many others will express, I will no longer trespass upon your patience.

Praying the Divine Head of the Church to continually lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes, and to build up its children in truth and holiness,

With great respect,

Your obedient servant,

Samuel Fuller.

Sept. 20, 1854.

REV. DR. GREGORY'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Rt. Rev. Dr. Otey, President of the Commission of Bishops, &c.

The name of the undersigned was subscribed to the Memorial, which has been referred to a Commission of the House of Bishops, at the last General Convention. Of the importance of the general subject of the Memorial, and of the *greater* importance of its candid consideration, both by the members of our Communion, and by others, I have a most thorough persuasion. At the same time I am more than ever convinced, that it is *not legislation*—not *schemes* and *plans* to promote unity, that is most needed in order to make our ecclesiastical system more efficient; but a more *earnest*, self-denying, *active*, and *devout* spirit, in all our *people*, clerical and lay, *in the use of our present system*, with such slight modifications as are within our power to make.

It is said that the Episcopal Church is the Church of the educated and the rich. This *is so*, to a considerable extent, particularly in the cities. This

would be no objection to us, if that class of people would make such concessions as Christian humility and self-denial demand—if they *really* evinced sympathy for the poor, and were *active* in those good works which have almost entirely been given up to Odd-Fellowship and Brotherhoods.

If our city Churches, e. g. would make their *seats free*—will any one doubt that it would work a revolution in the public sentiment in regard to the supposed aristocracy of Episcopalians? It cannot be done in the present state of feeling—the pride of social distinction is against it; and all the Canons and Councils in Christendom cannot make a Church *efficient* in which this feeling prevails.

I do not think the Lay-members of our Communion, generally, are very sensible of our great want: if they were, they would make a better provision for the support of the ministry—they would take a deeper interest in bringing forward and aiding candidates for the ministry—they would be more ready to provide for Deacons or assistants in all the larger parishes—they would take a livelier interest in all that parochial work which aims to make the Church the minister of the sick, the poor, the unfortunate, the widow, and the orphan. I do not clearly see how the conferring of Episcopal ordination on all sorts of sectarian preachers, is to be a remedy for this defect.

I am not aware of any desire on the part of sectarians to get Episcopal orders; that is, and remain in their present position. I am not aware that Baptists,

Methodists, or Presbyterians have ever *conceived* any such notion, as that their receiving ordination at the hands of *our* Bishops, would be an advantage to them or promote *unity* among the sects.

I deem it only respectful to the Commission, to submit answers to the questions which they have proposed.

I.

2. My impression is, that the character of a great deal of our preaching is *too prosy*, *didactic*, and *theological*—too much of the closet—that it does not aim straight at the spirit, and temper, and sins of the times—that it lacks adaptation, and neither takes hold of men nor affects them.

I incline to the opinion that, in many of our large towns and parishes, out-of-door preaching, by prudent, earnest, judicious clergymen, might be of great use.

Besides sermons from the pulpit, I have always found private conversation with individuals exceedingly beneficial and effective.

3. The *three* modes indicated I regard as exceedingly important. But, alas! in the present state of things, what clergyman, single handed, has time or strength to pursue them efficiently. I am scarcely fifty years of age; and already my broken health and shattered strength, indicate the fate that awaits my brethren, who attempt to do the work which is laid upon them.

4. I think most certainly we ought.

6. The defect of the system of family instruction,

is that it is almost entirely neglected. Of the Sunday School, is that it is *too much* in the hands of incompetent teachers. If the clergy were stronger handed, more of it could be done by them. For twenty-five years, I have never ceased to be *at the head* of my own Sunday School.

8. I do not know, unless the pastor can get them into a class of *candidates for confirmation.*

9. That it is well to *increase* the co-operation, where it can be judiciously and safely done, I am persuaded; but much must depend on the *pastor.*

10, 11, 12. Hard questions these. But the difficulty vanishes when men begin to be animated by the spirit of piety and true religion.

13. I do not think our people are sufficiently instructed on the dangers and responsibilities involved in the possession of property. Most people seem to have no notion of *any* danger or responsibility at all.

II.

1. (b.) There might, perhaps, be *a better* adaptation.

(d.) Not unless in authorizing the chanting of prose Psalms.

(e.) There are *sometimes* occasions, when the use of our entire service by missionaries is a little awkward; but the awkwardness ceases as soon as there are a few to join in the responses.

2. I think exclusively by the General Convention, which can easily adapt the conditions to local necessities.

3. (a. b.) I think neither as to time nor conformity.

4. None.

5. None.

7. I think it *very desirable.*

8. If it can be done as a part of the parochial system, in co-operation with the pastor, and under the Bishop, I should regard it as very desirable.

I end as I began, by iterating the opinion that it is not so much new plans, schemes, and changes, in our existing system, that is to make the Church effective—as the infusing a new spirit into our people. The temper of the times is as hostile to the spirit of true religion as it can be, and leave us Christians. The great body of our people are at ease—satisfied to have a *valid* ministry, and *valid* Sacraments, and a *sober* Liturgy, and a *conservative* ecclesiastical system. And the rest of the world have *no evidence* that we *care* very much about them. We are very *Apostolic* in books and on paper. If we were a little more Apostolic in religious earnestness, self-denial, good works, and concern for the salvation of our fellow men, I think the Memorial would be answered.

My hope has been, and my prayer is, that *this* may be its result.

HENRY GREGORY.

March, 1855.

DR. HOWE'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Right Reverend Dr. Potter, Bishop of the Diocese of Pennsylvania.

My Dear Bishop:—

Having affixed my name to a Memorial which was laid before the House of Bishops in October last, and having been informed that the Committee to whom it was referred are about to meet for its consideration, I trust that you, a member of that Commission, will not consider it impertinent in me to add, in a private communication, a few thoughts which have occurred to me in connexion with this important subject. Having been through my whole ministry (now of more than twenty-two years' continuance) in a position to observe the relation of our Church to the middling and lower classes as they are found in and around great cities, I cannot forbear the confession, that we do not, by the authorized appliances of the Church, reach and interest them. Individuals of these classes, by the force of early association, or a refinement of

taste unusual in their sphere, do retain or acquire a strong attachment to our worship, and derive unspeakable benefits from its use. But the fact is too glaring to be denied, that mechanics and labouring men are not in any considerable numbers reckoned among our people; and pastors, who will expose the truth in this behalf, must confess that of those who are reared among us to these industrial pursuits, very many desert the Church, and find religious associations more acceptable to them among other denominations. This is too general to be attributed to the unfaithfulness of ministers. There must be some lack in the system of means under which such disastrous issues occur.

I do not believe, sir, that the difficulty lies in the organization of the Church, which I hold to be divine, and therefore fully adapted to its Catholic purposes; nor in the fact that we have a Liturgical worship, proved to be best by the experience of the godly in all ages; but in the unvarying, and (in the esteem of many) invariable use of our forms, and other usages of worship. The Church has a feast of fat things spread out in her costly guest-chambers, but she does not send out homely messages, by the hands of lowly servants, into the lanes, and highways, and hedges to compel the poor and the blind to come in. There is a mode of worship required—initiatory, if you please, to the more stately service of the sanctuary—and a class of ministers to conduct it, that can find the people in their own neighbourhoods, and *catch*

without *taxing* their attention. These two ends are, I conceive, contemplated in the Memorial before you. It suggests a relaxation in the rigid sameness of our worship, authorizing a discreet adaptation of it to whatever place and circumstance. In this, the less prominent feature of the Memorial, I feel the more immediate interest.

It suggests, also, a movement towards Church unity, by providing for the bestowal of holy orders on godly men who will not in all things conform to our standard of worship and discipline; but will probably, without such authorization, undertake to minister in holy things. I think there are many good men, who will not go through with all the preparatory training of our clergy, nor come into full subjection to our economy, who would be glad to have Episcopal orders, the legitimacy of which alone is unquestioned; and that the granting of such license would go far to disarm prejudice, and to prompt the inquiry whether there is really anything imposed by the Church which a Christian man is justified in resisting. It seems to me, my dear Bishop, that independency has in this country about run its course, and demonstrated its dangers, intrinsic and incidental; and that this is the juncture, when some overture from that Church which is everywhere known, and secretly honoured as the centre of scriptural conservatism, would be received and widely accepted.

The Church may be entirely Catholic in her doctrine and polity, yet she can never be *practically* so

while she requires all men to worship everywhere in precisely the same forms, and under the conduct of ministers educated alike, for intercourse with the most refined and intellectual; and habited in the same official garments. I long to see all the people of God united under one comprehensive organization, which all shall acknowledge as the Church Catholic and Apostolic, and yet, with sufficient liberty in modes of worship to be all edified and happy in their fellowship.

And the advance for unity, I humbly conceive, ought to be made by the Church herself, who has something valuable to give. It might be more *just* for her to wait until they who have gone out from her return and sue for readmittance; but it would be more Christ-like, more in the genius of her mission, as the Lord's representative among men, to go out to them and offer the gifts wherewith she is intrusted. It may be that the sectarian spirit is still in many quarters so bitter and repellent, that this concession from the Church of our love would be hurled back with scoffing. But it is uncharitable to assume that it is; and even if it be, it is none the less desirable to win those who are not imbued with such a spirit; and, if all were so, the Church may repose more confidently in the assurance of her Lord's approval, when she has abated every possible hindrance to the unity of His people, and has cast out the sin of schism, to be cherished and perpetuated among them only who will not grasp in fraternal love her extended hand.

I presume not, right reverend and dear sir, to propose any plan for the execution of the objects contemplated in the Memorial before you. It is now in the hands of Fathers in the Church, of large experience and distinguished practical wisdom. If nothing more can be done to give pliancy to the worship of the Church, and to fit it for the shifting and diverse circumstances of the American people, I trust that at least there may proceed from the House of Bishops a recommendation to the several Diocesans to set forth forms of prayer for use in their respective jurisdictions, adapted to various occasions and places, other than those provided for in the "Book of Common Prayer." The end desired, to wit, the retention of "the common people" in the fellowship of the Church, is surely of very grave importance, and worthy of some concession, and some sacrifice of taste and feeling. Your Presbyters, in the immediate care of souls, are painfully impressed with the need of some action, which shall give us some supplementary instrumentalities, or teach us to use more effectually those we already have. The method in which Apostolic Orders can be more liberally conferred on those who will devote themselves to the ministry of the word, I shall not venture even to surmise. It is a subject too much involved to justify an individual in fashioning any scheme by himself, without consultation, and intruding it upon the notice of others. Much less would it become a Presbyter to offer his crudities of opinion upon a matter so peculiarly under

the cognisance and in the control of those who bear the Episcopal office.

Allow me to say, in conclusion, that the Church is waiting with the deepest interest, and most implicit confidence, the result of the deliberations of that wise and reverend Commission to whom this earnest and portentous document has been referred. Invoking upon you, my dear Bishop, and your right reverend associates, the wisdom which cometh from above, I remain,

With cordial respect and affection,

Your dutiful son in the Church of Christ,

M. A. DE WOLFE HOWE.

June 24, 1854.

REV. DR. LEWIS' COMMUNICATION.

Question I.

1. It seems to me questionable, whether Theological Seminaries, as usually conducted, are not detrimental in their influence upon the piety and practical efficiency of our young men preparing for the Ministry.

Students in them are apt to become partisans—to have their heads filled with Church politics—and so to neglect the culture of the heart's holiest affections, that many a young man has graduated with less of piety than when he entered. Practical experience is too much dissevered from study. Little attention is paid by the Professors to the cultivation of devotional habits in the students. It is with great reluctance that a license for lay-reading is given, though any other layman in good standing is encouraged to read in a destitute parish. Students in every other profession, in becoming fitted for it, combine, to a greater degree, practice and theory, as, for instance, medical students, who see much of hospital and other practice.

Professors, not themselves engaged in the active duties of the ministry, sink the minister in the scholar, and so are unfitted to send forth practical men. What student of medicine would study with a retired physician, or what clerk learn mercantile affairs with a merchant not in business? No doubt seminaries *might* have a great advantage over every other course of theological training, did they combine more of the practical knowledge of the duties of the ministry with the theoretical. As now conducted, they give too much of a mere continuation of the academic course.

Theological Seminaries, cut all to the one pattern of a favourite system, whether Evangelical, Sacramentarian, New School, Old School, or German Theological—so that it may be known, by hearing one sermon, from what seminary a preacher graduated. Give to one man whatever text you will, he leads you to man's depravity and justification by faith, while another on the same text will bring in the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments. Now if theology were learned in connexion with visits among Sabbath-breakers, drunkards, lovers of pleasure, errorists of all sorts, the real necessities of men would be forced upon the attention, and the Gospel remedy brought to mind, and instead of systems we should have wants met by the Gospel of Christ.

There were schools of the Prophets under the Old Testament, but the young men accompanied the Prophets in their labours and visits through the land.

Timothy, and others in the New Testament, learned theology while journeying with Missionary Apostles.

Ministers who in early life have been brought most into contact with their fellow men, in all sorts of situations, will generally be found to be most successful; therefore, that contact would be helpful in the *training* for the ministry.

Theological Seminaries, among other denominations in this country, have been fruitful sources of error and division.

The Church of England has done very well without seminaries.

Had I a son preparing for the ministry, who had already had a good academic discipline, I should be inclined to think he might study theology to the best advantage with some rector of a parish whose own labours testified that he had found the secret of success, and who, with study, would employ him as far as a layman could go in missionary or pastoral duty, or, better still, who would procure for him deacon's orders, under the new canon, and keep him two or three years in that position acquiring the theoretical and practical knowledge of his profession. Or, I should regard a situation for him with a bishop who would direct his studies, and send him forth in occasional missionary duty, or take him with him in his visitations, as very desirable.

It is proverbial, that no sermon written in a seminary was ever fit to be preached. What a proof of defect somewhere? Who would ever make a master

workman, that had never in his apprenticeship turned off anything in his line fit for use? Why should a man, with one month's experience in a parish, so improve in sermonizing, that his best efforts in the seminary should be cast aside as worthless? If a month's experience works such a change, why not give him a little more of that experience in his seminary course?

4. In almost every parish there can be found at least one man so respected for piety, and so respectable for all other qualifications, as to be able to fill well the office of a deacon. Let him be ordained. He can greatly relieve the rector in his seasons of physical weakness, by taking a part of the service; he can relieve the congregation on Communion days by helping in the Communion; and he can superintend the Sunday School, visit the sick, and distribute alms to the poor, to greater advantage, clothed with such an official character.

Let me state my own position. With my long continuance in the ministry, I may well be expected to be always prepared for preaching, and am so, and wish no assistance in that duty save such as I receive from visiters and exchanges. Parochial duty falls on me, and would, if I had many assistants. My actual want of help then is, simply for some one to take part of the service, especially in the morning, and assist in the Communion. To meet this want I have now a presbyter who might, if relieved, have charge of a parish, with greater advantage to himself and to the Church. Give me one or two deacons upon whom

I could call for the aid I need, and my presbyter assistant might be relieved. And I could also find ample room for any services of my deacons that I could spare, in Mission Sunday Schools, or in opening places for worship among the poorer localities of the city, where, under my oversight, new Churches might in time spring up.

We have now, virtually, but two orders in the ministry.

Next to the enlarged influences of the Holy Spirit, among things desirable for our Church, is a free ordination under our new Canon respecting deacons. It would draw out and employ talent now lost to us, relieve pastors, and supply the higher ranks of the ministry with the very best recruits, such as had been already well tried in a preparatory discipline. Let there be free ordination, and such as are incompetent for anything more, will remain at their own level, while such as have used the office well, may purchase to themselves a good degree. If we had had this Canon in years past, we should not only have gained good men for the higher ranks, but we should have been spared some unworthy accessions to them from those who would have remained deacons all their days, had it not been considered almost obligatory to advance to the priesthood after one year. We should have saved, too, in another way, for many have been ordained to the priesthood, intending to devote themselves to teaching, professorships, editorial labours, &c., which seem almost a violation of ordination vows,

while they would be perfectly consistent with the new Canon.

Ought not Deacons to be the most numerous of the orders of Ministry? One High Priest—one family of Priests—thousands of Levites—one Lord Jesus, the Great Bishop of souls—twelve Apostles—seventy Deacons—seven Deacons in the Church at Jerusalem.

7. Multiplying services does not tend to increase piety. Their increase is often a mark of spiritual decline, as in the Jewish Church, when God said, "to what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me?" And in the Church of Rome, which outvies all others in services and sins. Multiplying services as a remedy for our wants, would be as multiplying meals to a sick man, who has already perhaps too many, and who needs rather to have those he already has made more simple and nourishing. We need earnest prayers for the influence of God's Spirit. "Wilt thou not turn again and quicken us, that thy people may rejoice in thee?"

I do not see how the same church edifice can be occupied by more than one congregation. Each swarm needs its own hive, and new hives must be built for the increase. The Romanists have three sets of pew-holders to a pew, but one service satisfies with them, and to kneel towards the Church in the streets would content them, and they know nothing of many things essential to Protestant worship. So that they are no models for us.

8. In the Church of the Holy Trinity, we have, 1.

An infant class for such as cannot read. 2. A Sunday School proper into which infant scholars are advanced. 3. Two Bible classes, male and female, to take those who feel themselves too old for the Sunday School, but who may there become matured to act as teachers, so that the circle is complete.

A teachers' meeting, it seems to me, may be so enlarged, as to bring in many not engaged in teaching, giving them a gathering place where they may form pleasant Christian acquaintances; where strangers in our cities may be introduced and find preservatives from temptation; where aggressive movements on surrounding ungodliness may find helpers, and where that point which Church brotherhoods, of which I have no good opinion, vainly strive to meet, may be supplied. I am trying such a plan.

9. The laity may be encouraged to labour, in our Church, without any great danger of nourishing a spirit of insubordination to the clergy, so prevalent and hateful in Congregationalism. The whole bent of our institutions is against mobocracy; and rarely has there been a case where a rector has had to complain of being trampled upon by his people. Now, they are too much excluded—not from legislation, not by constitutional provisions, but by usage and actual practice, from co-operation in efforts to save souls. Send them to converse with the neglectors of God—call them into council in missionary and charitable operations—urge them to social and united prayers for Christ's cause, and we should see the city

of our God made glad, as by a new and refreshing stream.

11. Show special interest in young men—recognise them, employ them, ask heads of families to open doors of hospitality to them, where refined social intercourse, sanctified by religion, may elevate, purify, and save them. It is a great advantage to a single, unpolished, inexperienced young man, possessing great susceptibilities for improvement, with corresponding facilities for temptation and error, to have free and kindly access to one truly intelligent Christian household. I have seen gems of beauty and worth cut out by such a process, from unpromising rough ashlars, that might have otherwise lain neglected and useless.

13. Bring the laity to examine the field, and to take part in the work of supplying its destitution. Sad was the blow given to the missionary spirit among us, by that resolve of our General Convention, which made every baptized Churchman a member of our Missionary Society. Before that day, voluntary associations were springing up in every parish, that show forth the interest, strength, contributions, and prayers of the laity; but all died at a blow, and nothing has ever yet appeared to make good their loss.

II.

1.—*Answer.* Yes; most decidedly.

(a.) By dividing, not leaving out anything from the

Prayer Book, but letting it be discretionary to use one, two, or all of our three services for the morning.

A former Congregational minister, now a candidate for orders in our Church, said to me, recently, that he claimed to know something of the feelings of outsiders towards our Church; and that he believed the great length of the service was the great bar to our progress among them; that it was not a Liturgical service that was objected to; that our form of government would be hailed by a great many as a happy relief from the tyranny of volunteer bishops, one or two of whom might be found in every consociation; but that the division and shortening of the service, he was convinced, would do more than anything else to make our Church acceptable to those without her pale.

So wide spread is the same feeling among ourselves, that it seems as if a discretionary power of shortening the service must be conceded. For myself I should never ask it—and have never used even the liberty which some do already take, and perhaps never should use that which might be conceded. But why should I be a law to others? Why should as good, or better Churchmen, who ask this concession, and will not abuse it, have it denied? Why should not a top-bar be let down to those disposed to come in to our rich pastures, if they cannot climb over it; and if it be not one that Christ put up, but one that the Church has made and intended to be movable?

(c.) By altering the preface in the Confirmation office; giving a prayer for missions; for the increase of ministers; for Sunday Schools; for travellers by *land*, with thanksgiving for safe return; by striking out the rubric forbidding the Burial Service to be used over unbaptized adults; for if the service be only for the *living*, why make any discrimination? if it be for the dead, why use it over a baptized infidel or drunkard, and refuse it to a Quaker, or an over-scrupulous or late repenting member of our own congregation? It is now a trap and snare to the clergy, without any manner of use to the people; for no one was ever driven to baptism by the fear of burial without the service. The punishment falls on the clergy and surviving friends.

3. Yes, in my opinion.

(a.) As to time and qualifications, I have known not a few, in my day, among the Methodists, who have looked wistfully and long towards our ministry, but were kept back by the high standard of literary acquirements demanded, and the expense and time required in preparing for it. Some of them I have helped into our ministry, where they are now successfully labouring. Others have not had courage for the attempt. It was only yesterday I heard from one who had formerly been a Methodist minister, of two in that ministry who would gladly come into ours, and he said he knew it to be the position of a great many more. Why not give to our Bishops discretionary power to shorten the time, and dispense with certain

requirements of the Canon? One who has brought his mind up to the point of asking orders from our Bishops, must have usually passed through a long preparatory process, and become well settled in his Church views, ere he could take that step, for it is painful in the extreme. Why test his sincerity and attachment to our principles any further, when he has given the best proof of both by that which is as a death-struggle to one of any feeling,—the renunciation of all his old friends and ways? Saul of Tarsus might with as much propriety have been kept back from baptism and the ministry. Here is a neighbour of mine, of the Congregational Church, possessing one of the most gifted minds in the country; who is supposed to be the author of a series of articles in the Independent in favour of a Liturgical service; who is urging upon his people the use of the Lord's Prayer, and the recital of the Creed every Sunday, and also of the Ten Commandments, and, by various other movements, showing a tendency towards the Church; why not set open to such an one the door of entrance, by allowing an abbreviation of the service, and an immediate admission to our ministry, so that, if he and his people chose, they could at once be numbered among us? An uncle of mine renounced the Congregational ministry, and seventy of his families followed him at once into our fold, forming an Episcopal Church which yet remains (more than half a century), where before there was none. Such things might oftener be witnessed, did we offer more facilities. Does any denomi-

nation offer fewer? Would it encourage desertion, to put deserters on short allowance, treat them with a show of suspicion, and not allow them, till after long trial, to enter the ranks?

5. That disposition might exist to a great degree, and yet pride of sect would keep it from being manifested, except where it had risen to a determination to sacrifice all, and come among us. That it does exist more largely than appears on the surface, we may well conclude from the numbers that have brought themselves to the resolution to make the change, from their testimony with regard to the feelings of those they have left behind, and from the oft-repeated remark of eminent ministers and men among those of other names, "If I were to live my life over again, with my present views, I would be an Episcopalian."

By opening the door more widely to those favourably disposed to our Church, we must not fear lest we should gather in those who would eventually break down its distinctive principles; for experience shows that such converts are apt to be more zealous for them than old Churchmen. I have always cautioned such persons against extreme churchmanship.

The history of errorists in religion shows that, at a certain stage of maturity, they divide into two parts, one going to a wilder extreme, and the other returning to orthodoxy, as among Friends, Unitarians, &c. By setting open the door freely, we should gain the best part of those of other names—the conservative, the quiet—while the radicals, &c., would not be disposed

to come among us, but wax worse and worse, till they become extinct in their own corruption.

If none of the above thoughts prove worthy of consideration, they will, at least, show an interest in that great work the Committee have in hand. God guide them to happy results!

DR. MUHLENBERG'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Rt. Rev. Bishop Otey, Chairman of the Commission of Bishops.

Right Reverend and Dear Sir:—

Allow me to say a few words in regard to my recent letter, which I ventured publicly to address to yourself.

Great has been my surprise at the comments which it has called forth in various and opposite quarters. I fondly hoped that the dread which was expressed of mischief to the Church, lurking in the vague terms of the Memorial, would be quite allayed, when distinct statements were put forth of "what the memorialists want"—so reasonable and moderate did I deem them, and such I am persuaded they would be *generally* deemed, were they calmly and candidly considered. Instead of that, or of any temperate discussion of the several points at issue, there has been a rejection of the whole, and in language so denunciatory that I can account for it only by supposing that

its authors, having made up their minds beforehand, did not care to construe fairly, much less charitably, what they felt bound to condemn. Such is not the way to treat views and sentiments bearing on the interests of the Church, entertained by her acknowledged well-wishers, and honestly exhibited for her good. To brand them as "mischievous," "revolutionary," "heretical," &c., is scarcely enough. Something like proof should be attempted. The minds of the Commission, I trust, will not be affected by this unfair dealing—rather I would hope it will dispose them to a more careful impartiality in weighing considerations assailed less by argument than by opprobrious and contemptuous words. The wishes of the memorialists are set down under the four following heads.

1. A repeal of the concluding clause of 45th Canon.

2. The addition of a clause to that Canon, declaring that it applies only to the public services in regularly organized congregations.

3. Some action by the Bishops which will authorize them in their respective Dioceses to grant certain dispensations in the use of the forms for Morning and Evening Prayer.

4. The appointment of a permanent Episcopal Commission on Church Unity.

Now which one of these four requests, I humbly submit, is so extravagant, or so hostile to any principle of the Church, as not to deserve a hearing? If any of them can be thought so monstrous, I suppose it must be the first: viz. that which asks for a repeal of

the prohibitory clause of 45th Canon: "In performing said service no other prayers shall be used," &c.

In urging this, several arguments are adduced and dwelt upon with the earnestness which the subject naturally inspires. To all which the reply is that our object is to set aside the Liturgy—that in place of its sublime and venerable forms, we would substitute the crude effusions of ignorance and fanaticism—that it is marvellous when some of the most respectable Christian bodies around us are for *returning* to their Liturgies, we should be for *abandoning* ours. How comes this extraordinary perversion of our petition? Is it undesigned misapprehension? Have we expressed ourselves with such an unfortunate ambiguity? We have said in words, as plain as words can be, that it is not the prescriptions of the Canon, but its *pro*scription, at which we demur. We have not written—we could have no heart to write—an iota in disparagement of the Prayer Book. Most emphatically have we expressed ourselves to the contrary—and if we have not said more, it has been because it seemed idle to be avowing our poor admiration of what has commended itself to the love and veneration of some of the holiest men that ever lived. What would our appreciation be worth (particularly in the cant phrase in vogue) of prayers that were good enough for Usher, Hooker, Hall, and saints like them, stars in our calendar? Following these great and good men (at least those of them whose sentiments and practice on the point in question we know), we see

no incompatibility in praying according to a Liturgy, with freedom in further praying, so far as from time to time there is need. Such is the freedom we ask. The Canon, as it now stands, denies it to us. We ask that its restraint may be removed. But what has that to do with the "tampering with," or the undervaluing of, the Liturgy, with which we are charged? Can we be answered only by misrepresentation? Can men disprove the reasonableness of what we ask, only by showing up the unreasonableness of what we do *not* ask? Suffer me a few words more on this point. I shall not dwell so long upon any one of the remaining three.

In this matter of liberty of prayer, we are contending for the free exercise of the right of petition. Prayer is petition to God. The united prayer of the assemblies of the faithful is the most availing petition. The right of such petition to God, we cannot have circumscribed; we claim it in its fullest and largest extent. So far as we can exercise it in the words provided for us, we are content to do it. We delight to do it. We ask no better words—but whatever be their excellence, they are the vehicle of but the common wants of all and on ordinary occasions—and these general wants indeed make up the great burden of all public prayer. But besides them there are private local and peculiar wants; there are the necessities of extraordinary occasions, of times and circumstances, for which no adequate expression can be anticipated; yet which a sense of our own needs, or

sympathy with our brethren, or concern for our neighbours, or our interest in the community at large, will prompt us to bring before the Hearer of prayer, when gathered before Him for the purpose of prayer. In this we cannot be let or hindered. The right of petition implies the right to present our petition in whatever form we will. You must not dictate the words for us. You cannot do it any more than you can dictate our feelings and desires. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh, and it must not be restrained from speaking when it listeth, in words of its own. You cannot always be the mouth-piece of the heart, either of the individual or of the congregation when bowed together as one man under some unusual pressure before the mercy seat. Then words flow apace. They may or may not be the words of the book. They may lack its chaste and beautiful phrase, yet they may be the words in season—the best of all words for the time. *Taste* is not the first rule for prayer. Taste is for the capricious ears of man—not for the gracious ears of the All Merciful. St. Paul seems not afraid of our violating it, when he bids us to come to the throne of grace *boldly*—literally with free spokenness, with liberty of speech. May any ecclesiastical legislation fence in the privilege which the Apostle has left wide open? The highest authority which the Church can plead for ritual enactments, is the divine prescription of the Lord's Prayer. But let not the sanction of that prescription be pushed too far. Our Lord gave one set

form—He did not forbid all other forms. Rather while He enjoined a literal use of that (so let it be assumed), He designed it to be the model of other prayers. "Thus pray ye"—not only in these words, but let them be the sum and substance of all your prayers. So the Church has understood her Lord. She enjoins His prayer *verbatim* in each of her offices, and adds further prayers in accordance with it. The whole Liturgy may be regarded as a development of the Lord's Prayer. To say this is its highest eulogy. But let not the Church claim more for her development than her Lord has done for His original. As He did not say in these words, and these alone ye shall pray, so let not her make that exclusive demand for the forms which she has wrought out from those words. Let her not claim for her half-inspired compositions, more than is claimed by its Author for the composition wholly inspired. As if the Liturgy had exhausted the Lord's Prayer, let her not proceed to put a seal on our lips in a syllable beyond. Let her Liturgy answer the double purpose of the Lord's Prayer—a set form and a directory of devotion. The Canon forbids its use as a directory, and so far diminishes its practical value. This is not to follow the example of the Master—it is to exceed it. Unlike Him, His Church—no! the Canon, which is an excrescence on the Church—says, Thus and thus only shall ye pray. Cut off the excrescence. Let the Church be content to exercise no more exclusive prerogative than her Master; and from Him let her learn

to teach her members, especially her ministers, as He taught His disciples.

We shall come to a clear understanding of our subject by considering what the Liturgy is, and what it is not. It is the solemn oblation of prayer and praise to the Almighty by the Church, in her corporate capacity. It is the perpetual offering on her altars, from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same. Hence, its materials should be from the richest and purest in her storehouses of devotions. It should be the fine gold, the frankincense and myrrh of the wisdom and piety of ages. Changes or additions should not be made, save for grave and weighty reasons, which can be but of rare occurrence. Since the Church, as a whole, continues the same from age to age, and He, to whom she brings her offerings, changes never —the Liturgy is the grand objective service of the Church, and, therefore, in its degree and kind, should be like the Divine object to which it looks—the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. To subject it then to the mind of individual officiators, or of particular congregations, to make it consist of extemporaneous offerings, must be to lower and mar its character, and would evince ignorance of its nature and design—would be to substitute the crude and evanescent for what has stood the test of centuries. Such is the Liturgy—the united voice of the Church ascending in the Confessions and Misereres, the Te Deums and Litanies, common to all her members. That which the Liturgy is *not*, *cannot*, from its very nature, be,

is the expression of wants and feelings peculiar to an individual member, or to a certain number of individual members, of the Church. Our Liturgy has no utterance for what they would utter as individuals. It knows nothing of their particular wants or experience. But then, shall these never have leave to vent themselves in the sanctuary? Shall these be denied an utterance? Shall private griefs and joys be kept in abeyance, and be commanded to be still, in the house of prayer and praise? In the Communion office, which is eminently *the* Liturgy, shall not the absent, the sick, the dying communicant be permitted to send in his petitions to his pastor and brethren to be offered by them amid the sacred mysteries, when intercessions, we may believe, are most availing? The Liturgy does not forbid that. It is not so cold-hearted. It would pause, so to speak, in its general office, to give opportunity to the single supplicant. It stops for the preacher to go into his sermon; and, when prayer is connected with it, why should it not also stop for him as a merciful and compassionate priest—pleading with God in such words as he can, and as best suit the case, for the poor brother or sister, who begs to be remembered as present in spirit at the sacred feast. Let the Liturgy be considered the common voice of the whole Church, and special prayers as the voice of particular congregations; we shall then hear no more of our dishonouring the former by asking free liberty in the latter. Here it occurs to me to say that, if the words in the Canon, "the said service," be authoritatively

interpreted to refer to the Liturgy, as distinguished from special prayers, our object would be attained. It would be tantamount to repealing that clause of the Canon; and, perhaps, the most unobjectionable mode of doing it.

One word more in regard to special or occasional prayers. It is now generally admitted that we need a considerable increase. In the course of the discussion on the Memorial in our Church papers, almost all the writers have granted that much; and many of them have enumerated subjects for which prayers and thanksgivings are much to be desired. Suppose, then, that all these subjects could be anticipated (which, of course, is impossible), and that we had nearly a century of all imaginable forms, ready to be appended to our present collection, are we quite sure that they would be altogether fit to be so appended? What committee would undertake to prepare so large addition to the Prayer Book, to be *permanently* incorporated with its contents? Whose compositions, in so wide a range, would be worthy to be made part and parcel with the ritual? Verily, they who propose this, honour the Prayer Book far less than ourselves, who would leave it as it is, and at the same time leave the minister, on extraordinary occasions, to the best of his ability. Are we to presume that he has no ability? Ability not exercised is apt to be lost; and that, indeed, in the matter in question, may be more or less the case with us Episcopal ministers, who, from long disuse, might be slow in gaining free expression in public prayer.

Is it not a freeness that *should* be gained? We acknowledge a gift in preaching to be cultivated. Is there no such thing in praying? By adopting the course proposed, i. e., refraining from making additions to the Prayer Book, and not restraining the minister when moved to lift up his voice to Heaven, two sacred trusts will be kept unimpaired—the Liturgy, and that more sacred still, the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

For that liberty, in the privilege here asserted, we shall continue to sue until it be obtained. We cannot rest content in a disfranchisement which affects not only ourselves, but our congregations; for they can never engage in united prayer beyond the bounds of the ritual, as long as their spokesmen are thus bound. Thus it is the liberty of the *people*, as well as of the priest, for which we pray. I trust that measures will be taken to make it the subject of a special petition to the next General Convention, in a form in which it cannot be evaded. True, the petition may come from but a minority, a small minority; yet *minorities* have rights. Let it be remembered that the right we ask is for ourselves; we would impose nothing on others—we would put no bar to their pursuing their way—we beg only that the bar may be removed from ours. Content for themselves with the measure of freedom they enjoy, in order to our contentment we ask a somewhat larger measure. They kindly tell us, indeed, that it is not for our good—that the restraint under which we are impatient is a wholesome restraint—that

from a tender and brotherly interest in us, they cannot release it. But if it does not agree with us; if the confinement we think is not for our health; and further, if we promise that with our enlarged liberties we will not molest them, we see not why, minority as we are, that we should be unheard. At any rate, let the next General Convention settle the question whether a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church may never open his mouth in prayer, in his *own* sanctuary, with and for his own flock, save in the *litera scripta* of the Book; and let Christendom be apprised of the fact. So much for the first of the wants of the memorialists. If to satisfy it would revolutionize the Church, she must be in a rather precarious condition. There should be more than a bit of a solitary Canon for her defence.

The second item of our wants is that the Canon, in enjoining the use of the Book of Common Prayer, be declared to apply only to the duly organized congregations of the Church. The reasonableness of this is obvious, since it only proposes to remove the interdict of law from what is already extensively practised of necessity, and against which the law is never enforced; in other words, to cancel a dead letter law. For such, in the premises, we are assured it is. In answer to the absurdities we have exhibited of missionaries proceeding at once with the Prayer Book, in new regions of country, and among people unchristianized; we have been told on all sides that, whenever it is done, it is a *gratuitous* absurdity; that the Canon was never

meant to impose the Liturgy on such occasions. Very well. Since that is understood, let it also be declared,—which is all we ask. If in this we are revolutionary, all the mischief we should do is already done.

The third of our requests is some action among the Bishops, whereby they will feel authorized to grant certain dispensations in the celebration of Morning and Evening Prayer; chiefly with the view to a more marked and devout observance of the Ecclesiastical Year.

This is so entirely in the Church line, that our brethren, on one side at least, might have been calculated on in its favour. That they have not cared to commend it, or to make it an exception in their general condemnation, is significant of the indiscriminate prejudice with which the whole movement is regarded.

The desired action recognises the ancient prerogative of Bishops to regulate the worship of their Dioceses; and the dispensing powers which it would have them exercise, is for a purpose that must be dear to every Churchman—the bringing out in stronger relief the diversified round of the festivals and fasts. In what respect the Church would thereby be damaged, it is difficult to foresee. Should there be a jealousy of the extension of Episcopal power, let it be observed, that it is rather for loosing than for binding; not for diminishing, but enlarging the range of service, within the order of the Liturgy. The lowest Churchman

need not fear the development of Episcopal functions in that direction. Suppose that, by the desired agreement among the Bishops, we should have the successive seasons of the Church Year illustrated by proper Prefaces, Canticles, Psalms, and Hymns; what but good could come of the increased interest which would thus be imparted to that which, next to the ancient Creeds, is the surest safeguard of the faith? Were we once used to a series of services, in beautiful and instructive vicissitude, we should wonder how we could ever have done without it. Whatever change this would involve, the materials for it being already in the Prayer Book—at farthest in the Bible—if revolutionary, would hardly be destructive.

On the fourth point in my letter—the appointment of a permanent Episcopal Commission on Church Unity—I will only observe that the hostility it has met with has been occasioned, I would hope, by a misapprehension of its design, arising from the way in which I have argued for it. The Commission, until vested with powers not yet asked for it, would be no more than the authorized organ of communication with surrounding Christian bodies, or individuals sound in the faith. Such communication might issue in action, for which, however, the Commission would require further instructions from the House of Bishops, or the whole Convention. Contemplating the result in the restoration of the evangelical commission to the Episcopate, to be exercised in granting holy orders on evangelical terms, I argued for the Commission, as the

necessary *preparatory* measure, by showing how it should approve itself to both of the leading parties in the Church, with the understanding that the Commission would (until further orders) confine itself to *preliminary*, or rather *tentative* action. I earnestly hope you will report in its favour. Discussing the proposition in conversation with many of our Clergy and several of the Bishops, I have found none to object to it, and most to give it their cordial assent. *Harm*, it could do none. The *good* to which it might lead, cannot be measured. At the least, it would be an *attempt*, an *essay* on the part of the only Church which can make it with any prospect of success, to gather into one the sundered multitude of believers on the old ground of the one Lord, the one Faith, the one Baptism. Is not the ability of our Church to put forth an effort to that end a talent, for the improvement of which she will be held responsible? Shall she hide it in a napkin—the napkin of her niceties and peculiarities?

Our Church (as is shown in a recent admirable charge by one of your brethren) has both a Catholic and denominational character. Which shall we now seek to develop? This, in reference to *all* the wants of the Memorialists, is the question before you in making up your report. If it be her denominational character that she is most concerned for, your report may be very brief. Dismiss the Memorial: Take your stand on the prudential maxim, "Let well alone:" our well-doing Church will continue to do well in her own

sphere and peculiar mission; with her stern integrity, her conservative policy, her refined taste and dignified bearing, she will always be most acceptable in the upper walks of life, where, indeed, as well as in the lower, there are souls to be gathered into the kingdom; while, also, she will always have a goodly number of retainers in her *beneficiaries* among the poor. As she is, she can thus prosper,—confessedly the most respectable denomination in the land. But if, without compromising any real advantages in that character, she is mainly bent on developing the Catholic elements in her constitution, then give her ample room for so glorious a design.

Bid her look over this vast continent, filling with people of all nations, and languages, and tongues, and see the folly of hoping to perpetuate among them an *Anglican* Communion that will ever be recognised as aught more than an honourable sect. Bid her give over the vain attempt to cast all men's minds into one mould.

Bid her cherish among her own members mutual tolerance of opinion in doctrine, and taste in worship; remembering that uniform sameness in lesser matters may be the ambition of a society, a party, a school, in the Church, but is far below any genuine aspirations of the Church herself.

It is the genius of Catholicism which is now knocking at her doors. Let her refuse to open. Let her, if she will, make them faster still, with new bolts and bars, and then take her rest, to dream a wilder dream

than any of the Memorial—of becoming the Catholic Church of these United States.

Pardon my length, my dear Bishop. I meant, when I began, to make merely a brief defence of my former letter. Should you deem what I have written worthy to be read to your Right Reverend Brethren at their present meeting, please do so, with the dutiful respects and unfeigned reverence of your and their servant and brother in Christ,

W. A. Muhlenberg.

DR. ODENHEIMER'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Right Reverend J. H. Otey, D.D. Chairman, &c. &c.

Right Reverend Sir:—

In reply to the communication from the venerable body of which you are chairman, inviting an answer to certain inquiries, the following suggestions are respectfully submitted.

I.

I. Improvements in candidates for holy orders:

1. In *learning*, by greater strictness in the canonical examinations.

2. In *piety*, by observing the Ember seasons as special periods for united prayer with and for them.

3. In *intellectual power*, by avoiding the sin of Jeroboam, 1 Kings xiii. 33, 34.

4. In *practical efficiency*, by employing them, under Episcopal supervision, in visiting the sick and in instructing the ignorant.

II. Changes in our preaching.

1. In *quality*, by aiming at expositions of, rather than logical deductions from, God's word.

2. In *quantity*, by not exceeding, ordinarily, half an hour in time.

3. In *style*, by being instructive rather than rhetorical.

4. In *variety*, by adding to sermons the reading of the Homilies, and familiar lectures on the duties of the Christian life.

III. Ministrations among the godless extra-parochial multitude.

Let our Dioceses, and especially our large cities, be divided into manageable districts, and let each district be assigned, under Episcopal supervision, to a Missionary, clerical or lay, who shall become acquainted with the character of every man, woman, and child in the district. Let the poor, sick, and destitute in these districts be attracted to Christ and His Church by

1. *Social intercourse*, in frequent visits.

2. *Extra-parochial services* at their own homes.

3. *Philanthropic labours*, in the shape of relief to the needy; cheap schools for the children; hospital accommodation for the sick, and reformatory homes for the penitent.

IV. Evangelists, deacons, and scholars.

1. For the extra-parochial purposes mentioned in the last answer,

"*Itinerating Evangelists*" are essential.

2. *Deacons*, necessarily permanent (i. e. incapable,

intellectually or socially for attaining to the priesthood), do not seem to be desirable.

3. Our theological and collegiate institutions would seem to afford sufficient provision, under present circumstances, for a clerical body more profoundly learned than the parochial clergy.

V. Division of labour.

The method of districting our Dioceses, and especially our large cities, referred to in the answer to the 3d question, would supply a field for the non-parochial Clergy, and gifted laymen.

VI. Defective instruction.

1. In the *family*, by not inculcating and enforcing subordination.

2. In the *Sunday School*, by encroaching on the parental obligations to teach.

3. In the *catechetical*, by indefiniteness, in not teaching thoroughly the Church Catechism.

VII. More frequent Sunday services.

In order to meet the wants of the different classes in society, we should multiply our services. There are some who could attend an early morning, or a night service only.

VIII. Instruction, &c., for young men.

1. On Sunday, by an afternoon Bible class.

2. On week days, by employing them in the philanthropic works which a proper system of city Missions (see answer to question 3d) would supply.

IX. Lay co-operation

Can be secured by putting into vigorous practice

the missionary system recommended in the answer to 3d question.

X. Christian brotherhood promoted.

By *working* together in some such systematic effort as has been recommended in answer to question 3d.

XI. To attract young men to our Churches.

1. Let us give them, when children, definite Church instruction.

2. Let us make our services as attractive as the spirit and intention of our Liturgy admit.

3. Let our pulpit instructions have greater relation to them as a class.

XII. To influence men of business.

1. By directing our preaching, more pointedly, against love of money.

2. By multiplying the means of grace, such as the Daily Morning, and Evening Prayer, and frequent Communions.

XIII. To increase pecuniary contributions.

1. By instructing our people on the responsibility of property.

2. By observing the Rubric, relating to liberality to the poor, in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick.

3. By adopting the *system* of a weekly Offertory; and the *principle* of St. Paul—"upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, *as God hath prospered him.*"

II.

I. Changes in Liturgy.

1. *Not* by lengthening, nor by shortening, but by dividing when necessary.

2. *Not* by changing the Lessons, &c., nor by multiplying special services and prayers, hymns, &c., but by thoroughly using those which we already possess.

3. The authorities of each Diocese have, or ought to have, liberty to set forth services for special occasions.

II. Conditions of ordination.

The Ministerial Commission is given to be exercised for the good of the Church generally; it would seem, therefore, that the conditions of ordination should be the same in all our Dioceses, and hence should be prescribed exclusively by the General Convention.

III. Conditions imposed on candidates from other Protestant communions should not be relaxed.

1. As to term of time.

2. As to degree of conformity to the Church.

IV. Facts relating to ministers of other Protestant bodies.

From conversation with such men as the Rev. Albert Barnes, D. D., I believe that *facts* are against the amiable theory of the Memorial.

V. Facts relating to the members of the above bodies.

From conversation with intelligent laymen of other Protestant bodies, I believe that they have no idea of unity as connected with or dependent on the Episcopate.

VI. Episcopal liberty (in Liturgies, &c.) in Diocesan matters.

If I apprehend exactly this question, I should reply that, in primitive times, that liberty and the responsibilities of Bishops were more distinctly asserted than in our day. See Canon 32d of the Apostolical Canons.

"Let the Priests and Deacons do nothing without the knowledge and consent of the Bishop; *for with him the people of God are intrusted, and of him the account will be demanded.*"

VII. Church provision for training teachers and nurses.

Better provision should be made,

1. By encouraging schools for teachers.

2. And by training nurses in connexion with Church hospitals.

VIII. System for females pursuing benevolent labours.

If the plan of districting our large cities, recommended in the answer to question 3d of 1st series, should be vigorously put into practical operation, there would be furnished the material for a systematic employment of all who had leisure and inclination for Christian exertion.

The only other remark which it occurs to me to make is a respectful suggestion to your Right Reverend body, that we, the parochial clergy, be urged to develope, to their fullest extent, the rich treasures of devotion already provided for us in our Prayer Book, so that we, or a future generation, may be able to

declare more exactly what changes, if any, it may be expedient to make in our Liturgical services.

With great respect,

Your son and servant in the Church,

W. H. ODENHEIMER.

September, 28, 1854.

REV. DR. TRAPIER'S COMMUNICATION.

Part I.

Dear Bishop Otey:—

In compliance with the printed request of the Bishops on Dr. Muhlenberg's Memorial, and with your desire as expressed by letter to me, I will try to offer, with all possible deference, such views as have from time to time been in my mind on the matters now under consideration in Committee. And as what I may have to say will be, of necessity, discursive, and I fear ill arranged, you will suffer me to put it into the familiar form of a reply to you, with the understanding that you will use your absolute discretion whether or no to lay it before your associates, assured that, if you throw it into the fire, when read only by yourself, there will be no one better pleased than I.

I. *On the present method of preparing young men for the ministry.* No doubt it greatly *needs* improvement in respect to, 1st, *Learning;* inasmuch as in

this our clergy generally are far from being as proficient as they should be. For proof of this we have to turn only to a comparison with our brethren of the English Church, by the side of whom our scholarship will be found to be extremely meagre; nor indeed can we feel that any clergyman can rightly be called "learned," if unable to read with ready intelligence at least the originals of the Holy Scriptures and the Latin—a degree of attainment at present reached by few. This deficiency, it will be admitted, is owing primarily to imperfect training in preparatory schools, and to the consequent impossibility of giving requisite thoroughness and compass to the instructions in Theological Seminaries, or under the direction of elder presbyters, who may have the care of candidates for orders.

The remedy would be a remodelling of academical teaching, and a lengthening of collegiate and theological preparation. But it is doubted whether in a state of society so impatient as is ours for premature entrance upon active life, and in a profession so ill supplied with men as is the sacred ministry, consent can be obtained from parents and children, or even from Standing Committees, Conventions, or Bishops, for this lengthening of preparation and this delay of active employment. Why not teach *Hebrew* at schools?

2*dly*. In *piety*. I apprehend that our candidates are left too much to themselves, and that, from a dread of that inquisitorial process to which others in other

denominations are subjected, we have not been always careful enough to inquire into the personal experience of individuals; but have taken too often for granted that a profession of a desire for the ministry has proceeded from not only a sincere, but a holy, motive; thus perhaps leaving some young men sometimes under a delusion, if not leading them into a mistake, hurtful to their subsequent usefulness, and to their inward peace of mind.

In remedy for this, it may be well that those, to whom their wish for the ministry is intimated, should speak to them freely, and from the first, of its high responsibilities, and aid them by familiar and affectionate suggestions in the difficult work of self-examination, and in the formation of those habits of personal piety and devotion, wherein the experience of a more advanced Christian, as a spiritual guide, may be of eminent service to a babe in Christ. Especially is this deficiency, and the need, therefore, of some effectual remedy, apparent in our Theological Seminaries, to which many of our young men are sent from distances which remove them beyond intercourse with former pastors and guides, away from the influences of pious relations, and among others as inexperienced as themselves; and therefore laying them open to such hurtful notions as may for the time be prevalent either within the walls of the seminary, or among the clergy, and in the community around. Thence are apt to proceed exaggerations of even those notions, through the fermenting of them

in youthful brains and ardent tempers, besides extravagances of party spirit, sure to spring up in seasons of excitement, and nowhere more likely than among *students*.

We greatly need a *resident chaplain* at each of our seminaries: some experienced and warm-hearted, sympathizing presbyter, who can and will be the ready adviser of the young men, one to whom they will be disposed to open their hearts, communicate their doubts and fears, and all the thousand searchings of spirit, which must arise in those who are conscientiously trying their own spirits in prospect of the awful responsibility of being "ductores dubitantium" in cases of conscience, as well as careful dividers and distributors of the bread of life. Nor will it do to look to the professors of the seminaries, or to a temporary "dean," to do all this; for their other duties are quite enough to preoccupy them, and to leave them little time for visiting the young at their rooms, especially in sickness; besides that, it is essential to the existence of the desired confidence that the office of spiritual pastor be *permanent*, and in the person of some one selected because of his peculiar aptitude for these very duties; and who may also, by familiar lectures on the pastoral care, on the model of Burnet's, or of Herbert's, or of Chrysostom's, adapted to present times, bring home to individual consciences the practical work of the sacred ministry.

3*dly*. *Intellectual power* is understood to mean the faculty of *making the most* of the mental and moral

capabilities with which individuals may be respectively gifted, unless the idea be also of some way of inducing young men of a higher order of talent than is commonly found among our clergy, to seek admission into our ministry.

If this last be the meaning, I fear, that so long as the world lasts it will be found that "not many wise men," &c., will be "called," in comparison with the number of those who are attracted by the more tempting prizes of ambition, wealth, literature, &c.; though I doubt not a larger proportion of young men of talent would be induced to study for the ministry, and as many perhaps as it would be safe so to influence, by increase of salaries and other comforts. If the former be the meaning, I know not of any other method for increasing intellectual power but by attention to the 1st and 2d of the present points, and to the

4*th*. Of *practical efficiency*—wherein, perhaps, more than in any other quality, our clergy are behind ministers of some other denominations; *e. g.* Methodists and Romanists. The secret of this may be found probably in the mode among us of teaching pastoral duty rather by *theory* than by *practice;* setting our young men, I mean, to learn *what* they *ought* to do, rather than to *do* it; training them in solitary study under the direction of a single presbyter, or in seminaries under several: but in either case without *active* engagement; so that, when they take charge of parishes, they may be ever so well furnished with the *implements* of usefulness, but have still to find out,

and that too each by himself in general, *the way to use* those implements. Now this is a course pursued *alone* in ministerial education; certainly it is not in the legal profession, where the student, while studying from books, is also made to draw up papers of various sorts, and encouraged to attend courts. Neither is it in the medical, where "walking the hospitals," and witnessing and assisting in surgical and other cases, is a part of the required preparation. Neither is it in the mechanical, where the apprentice to the carpenter, or blacksmith, or bricklayer, is set to *work* at the trade. Even so, why not make it a rule that every candidate for orders, before being admitted to that of Deacon, shall have been practically engaged in visiting the sick, teaching the young, &c., for a certain definite time? I know that this is the *theory* about Deacons with *lesser* qualifications; but until it be made the *sine qua non* for admission at least to Priest's orders, and all Deacons, unless so practised, shall be forbidden from taking sole charge of parishes, I apprehend that our clergy will continue as hitherto, far from being as "practically efficient" as they should be. Possibly the system of seminary, *i. e.* almost monastic, theoretical preparation may be combined with the practical, by requiring that the *vacation* in each seminary-year be thus spent in service under some parochial clergyman; and, if it be, there will result, I am persuaded, more "intellectual power," because more command of faculties possessed, than

with ever so much learning and piety, apart from this use of them in exercise.

II. *The prevalent character of our preaching is*, I should say, necessarily much affected by the mode of ministerial training just adverted to, and partakes of its defects; *i. e.* becomes theological, technical, controversial, essay-like, more of a "concio-ad-clerum" than of a popular appeal to dying sinners by dying sinners. This style of sermonizing has been for generations characteristic of most of our clergy, English as well as American; and to it, in part, is owing the proverbial dryness of sermons, and their want of interest for men of all classes, who are engaged if not engrossed in the practical business of daily life. Such we all know is not the case with sermons of French, German, Italian ecclesiastics, whether among non-Episcopal or Romish communions; nor can any one be familiar with the discourses, however elaborate, of Saurin, of Bourdaloue, of Massillon; or listen to the stirring extempore or memoriter addresses of most of the living preachers on the continent of Europe, without being made painfully sensible of the inferiority of Anglican alike and of American clergy in this faculty of *adapting their discourses* to the promiscuous audiences which compose every congregation, even in cities much more in country places, and most of all in illiterate communities. Hence it is, that with intellectual furniture comparatively so meagre, and with piety probably not more earnest, the Methodists, and Baptists, and Romanists succeed better than we in

awakening the minds and moving the hearts of the masses.

If so we would also, let us then discard these theological theses, these technical phrases, these closet essays, and, trying to look at the great truths of the Gospel as they are looked at from the arena of life, let us approach our people as from among themselves, speak to them in the language, and with the illustrations, of every-day life; drawing our imagery, as did our Master, from their own pursuits, and from objects around them, and *we* too shall once more be heard by "the common people" "gladly;" particularly if practised in extempore preaching, or at any rate able to resort to it on occasion.

Besides sermons from the pulpit, I have found it useful to deliver, on some day or days in each week familiar extempore lectures in exposition of some portion of Scripture in regular course; also at meetings of communicants addresses to them in enforcement of their duties, in exhibition of their privileges, and in explanation of the Communion Office of our Church. Also lectures on the Creed, Ten Commandments, and Lord's Prayer, and Sacraments, to persons preparing for adult Baptism or Confirmation.

III and IV. I know of no other mode of attaining the objects referred to by the third of these than by affirmative attention to the fourth, viz. by our having "*Itinerating Evangelists*," as well as settled pastors; and the only wonder seems to be that the former should ever have been thought superfluous in a world

which the Son of Man came to "*seek*" that he might "save," and by a Gospel, for which the natural heart has no inclination. Surely it stands to reason that the offers of this Saviour in this Gospel should not be *held in reserve* until they are *applied for*, but should be *pressed* upon those who care not for them, and are even averse to them; and that therefore we should not *wait* until the people organize themselves of their own accord into parishes or congregations, and invite a pastor to take charge of them, but should "*send out*" missionaries into "highways and hedges," and "streets and lanes," and to wharves and hovels, to "compel them to come in."

In a word, it is plain to me that there should be missionaries itinerating unceasingly in our populous cities, and in our rural districts, following up the wandering to their retreats, mingling with them familiarly at their places of labour, of amusement, of domestic retirement; especially in their sorrows, and their sicknesses; and urging on them, everywhere, day by day, "the truth as it is in Jesus;" and so leading them to attend on the Lord's Day in the Lord's house, and bringing them gradually under regular pastoral influences. Nor should it be forgotten that it is important in thus gaining access to the masses, that there be care taken for their bodies and their minds as well as for their souls; and that all the apparatus of free and "ragged" schools, clothing and fuel societies, medical aid, &c., &c., as in operation in England, may

with due modifications be rendered auxiliary in evangelizing our country.

Permanent Deacons may be safely left to the contingency of personal qualification for advancement to the higher grades; provided it be seen that none be so advanced until they have "purchased to themselves a good degree" by "using the office of a Deacon well:" a due regard to which condition would doubtless leave for life in the lower order men enough for its work, while the leaving of the prospect of promotion contingent on fitness would afford the wholesome stimulus which is among the divinely appointed incentives, and of which it might therefore be unsafe to deprive any. That there should be "a *portion of the clergy more especially devoted to theological and biblical studies*," is certainly desirable—but can scarcely perhaps be *provided for* by any legislation—scarcely by endowments; but must, perhaps for generations, in our new country, be left to individual taste, and competency, and circumstances. Even so I should say also of No. V., except that appropriate fields for such persons may be found in part in our Theological Seminaries, our Missionary Agencies, our editorships of reviews, and of the publication of Church societies, possibly of Church journals—if indeed a right spirit can by any means be infused into "hebdomadals."

VI. I do not know that we can be said to have at "present" any "system" of

Family instruction and training. Many families, professedly pious, being, it is feared, without any sort

of domestic devotion, and among those who do assemble children and servants for this purpose, there being only the reading of a few verses of Scripture, and prayers from some one or other of the many manuals in use for this purpose. Nor is it easy to see how improvements can well be introduced into that which must after all be left very much to the habits and circumstances of respective households. Only we may suggest that more pains be taken by our chief and subordinate pastors to enforce the obligation of family prayer, and to give practical directions for its better conduct, by such hints and appeals as to their wisdom may seem best: in particular that the use of hymns, and of a *responsive* service, be recommended as imparting a more social character to such worship.

Our Sunday Schools, it has been often remarked, have of late years passed too much from under *pastoral* control and direction to that of *lay* superintendence, and become too generally substitutes for old-timed catechizing. And I would, therefore, express earnestly the conviction that every pastor should himself be present in his Sunday School, question and teach its scholars, and keep up his authority over its teachers, prescribing such lessons as *he* may think will be most for the good of the former, and holding meetings of the latter to prepare them for teaching those lessons; having regard to the several seasons of the Church's year as they come round, and drawing attention to the services provided in our Prayer Book for those seasons. *For catechetical instruction*,

I know of nothing better than our Catechism, Collects, Epistles, Gospels, and Hymns; all of which admit of indefinite illustration and proof from Scripture, and of application to the every-day concerns of life, in thousands of ways, which will readily occur to the mind and heart of the faithful pastor.

VII. I have thought that it is well to open in cities and large towns a few of our Churches at convenient distances on Sunday *nights*, in order that those whose domestic employments hinder their attendance during the *day* (such as house-servants of all sorts), may have an opportunity of attendance. But I deprecate the impression that a third service is advisable for those who have already been at two on Sunday, and who had better therefore stay at home in the evening, think over the sermons and other teachings of the day, and interest the young and the dependent by familiar conversation and reading; instead of leaving children to servants, and servants to the intrusion of unsuitable companions, while elders and superiors are enjoying the questionable privilege of listening to a "popular preacher."

VIII. Bible Classes are sometimes rendered attractive enough to induce attendance of boys after leaving Sunday School; also familiar lectures on the Evidences of Christianity: and Parish Libraries may foster in them a taste for edifying reading.

IX. "Church Brotherhoods" are apparently, at present, the favourite expedient for bringing about *lay* co-operation in pastoral work. But they seem

justly open to exceptions, and cannot, in my opinion, be "safely" made use of, at least as hitherto organized. But I see not why pastors may not call upon pious people, female as well as male, to visit the sick and the poor, and report to them; while by statements of need, from the pulpit or the chancel, the congregation generally may be moved to furnish the means of relief. All this may be under the direction of each pastor, with such interchanges of intelligence and assistance with other pastors and people as may result in *systematic* effort, embracing towns, districts, and even Dioceses, while leaving untouched parochial and diocesan independence. I am strongly of the impression that almost every pastor can find in his congregation at least some four or five good people to begin with, who at his summons will undertake to seek after the sick, the poor, and the suffering, and to take to them the Communion alms, and other bounty of the congregation. I am sanguine in the hope that the example would soon be followed by one, and then by another, until there would be gathered around the pastor a band of efficient lay-helpers sufficient in numbers and zeal to keep up a constant supervision of a certain space around the Church, and to see to the wants of all within it. Thus, perhaps, by accustoming our laity to such work, we should educe from them that very class of *deacons*, for which we are now yearning in vain, but which may be more probably raised up through God's grace by the *practice of*

charity, than canonical enactments, however explicit. Thus too would be brought about

X. *True brotherly intercourse.* "The fellowship of Christian minds" being more efficiently awakened by *working together* for Christ's sake, than by exhortations the most earnest and regulations the most judicious. Nor do I know of any method more likely to accomplish what is contemplated in questions.

XI. and XII. Inasmuch as I really think the main reason why our lay people do so little is that we of the clergy have so long been undertaking to do so much. Hence has arisen the prevalent impression that religion in all its branches is for the clergy to attend to; while the laity, except in things which concern the soul's salvation of each, are to be passive recipients, or at most mere money-chests whence to draw the means of doing good. Whereas, among the denominations where the laity are called in to take part in the work of evangelizing (as among the Methodists), no lack of lay co-operators is felt, and *that* too even where the same laity are not admitted to a share in legislation or discipline. While among us, though in conventional organizations they are on an equal footing with the clergy, they seem to think that in carrying out the system of our Church in its influence upon the world around, and in its care of its own members, *they* have nothing to do. But let us set them to *work*, and their hearts will be drawn out to us and to each other; "the cares of this world," and "the deceitfulness of riches," and "the pleasures of

life," will all become less engrossing; and the business men, and the fashionable women, and the gay youth, will be the more likely to find other and higher satisfaction in the blessed work of doing good.

XIII. In this Diocese of South Carolina, stated collections, monthly in our cities, and yearly in our country parishes, are generally taken up in aid of Missions. A monthly lecture, giving missionary intelligence, and presenting motives to missionary effort, is delivered in Charleston by the clergy in rotation, and special appeals are made for special objects. The "Spirit of Missions" is circulated and subscribed for; and we know of nothing more that can be done under God, but a more extensive and faithful use of these approved and long-practised means; for the missionary measures of 1835 have always been heartily approved among us, and our only regret has been that our measure of effort has not been up to the standard then set before us.

I beg pardon again for being so prolix on this branch of the queries proposed; and that they may be kept apart from the other, I here beg leave to assure you that I am very respectfully,

Yours in Christ,

Paul Trapier.

May 4, 1855.

PART II.

DEAR BISHOP OTEY:—

ON the *second* branch of the questions proposed, I desire to premise that I receive heartily every proposition in our Prayer Book, nor would I take out of it a single word. Not that I think that it is exempt from that imperfection which must attach to everything human, nor that therefore there may not be occasion, from time to time, to apply to it that "blessed liberty" which itself sets out by asserting. For indeed I hold that the truest *conservative* is he, who, while averse to needless change, and cautious of any change, is ready, under the rule of a wise discretion, to make such changes by proper authority as may be demanded by a regard for the main end, for which the Prayer Book itself was compiled, of giving "the Gospel in the Church" most savingly to a perishing world—whereas, on the other hand, I hold that he is a *destructive*, who by too stiff adherence to things as they are, not only hinders "them who are without" from coming into the Church, but may drive those within to seek elsewhere (as did the Methodists in England) a freedom, which, if judiciously accorded and wisely regulated, might have averted schism. Being decidedly of opinion, that the time has now come for our Church, in this country, to adapt herself somewhat more to the state of things around her, I am in favour of modifications, though not in the

substance of our Prayer Book, yet in the *order for the use* of its several parts, and in the *addition* to it of a few prayers hereinafter specified.

1. Changes, I think, can advantageously be made in our Liturgical services.

(a.) *Not* by "lengthening" any; *but* by "shortening and dividing;" *e. g.* by letting us have only the Communion Service (the whole of it, I mean) on Communion Sundays—with a sermon, of course, as part of it—even though the "Order for Morning Prayer" may not have been used at an earlier hour of the day. The effect of this, I am confident, would be to give to the act of communicating a solemnity and importance not attaching to it now, that it comes in as a sequel to a service, which on other Sundays is held to be complete without it.

(b.) Certainly "the Lessons, Anthems, &c.," might be "better adapted to the different ecclesiastical seasons." Even Dr. Berrian admits this: and *who* is there of our clergy or people that has not felt that the "Venite" is not as suitable as would be a penitential Psalm in Lent? or that the 23d Psalm would be most appropriate at the beginning or the end of a year? or that the Lessons in the Calendar on week days are often most unseasonable? or that in Passion Week we might have something more apposite than the 10th and 11th chapters of Daniel, which not only have scarcely a reference to the Saviour's death, but cannot be understood without the accompanying comment of a Rollin or a Newton? in short, that our people would enter much

more thoroughly into the spirit of Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, and Ash Wednesday, and Easter Day, and the succeeding Sundays, if the Anthems and Lessons were more in the same spirit? Particularly have I felt this on Easter Day, the first lessons for which, for both morning and afternoon, are about a Jewish ordinance, whose evangelical reference is too remote to be rendered readily appreciable by our congregations, without at least a degree of explanation, which does not chime in well with the fresh-springing joys of the day. Throughout Lent the heart yearns for anthems less jubilant than the Venite, the Te Deum, &c., and feels that between Easter and Ascension Day, there should be more habitual reference to the past and coming events in the Saviour's life.

After Whitsunday also, the change is so instantaneous to Trinity Sunday (from which latter instead of from the former of which festivals, as in ancient times, the days thence round again to Advent take their name), that there is danger of not due prominence being given to the *Spirit's* nature and offices in the minds of our people. We need a Whitsunday season as well as an Advent, a Lent, and an Easter.

(c.) A prayer for *increase of labourers*, and one also for *missions*, are confessedly desiderata—as has been often remarked by others—and it seems proper, that having prayed for a sick child, we should have some words in which to *give thanks* for its recovery. Also we need a prayer for travellers by *land*. But for other individual cases, a reinsertion of the clause

in the English Prayer Book, in the "prayer for all conditions of men," and in the "General Thanksgiving," may suffice.

(f.) I would plead earnestly for "larger liberty to the authorities of each Diocese," inasmuch as it is impossible in a country so widely spread as ours, and made up of people of habits so diverse, and in so different stages of civilization, for any one ritual to be adapted equally to all; from the highly refined and cultivated of our cities to the Indian of the West, the negro of the South, and labouring classes everywhere; especially where the Church has to be introduced for the *first* time. It cannot be so introduced at the outset in all its developments. It scarcely ever is. The most strenuous sticklers for undeviating rubrical conformity, *have* to depart from it under certain contingencies, as was apparent during the discussion of Mr. Tomes' Canon in the last General Convention, where every speaker came out with his "peccavi." Hence it results that a liberty is *taken*, which is not *expressly granted*, and *that* is done without authority, which some of us wish should be "under authority," not of individual discretion, but of Episcopal wisdom. And we hold that there is no more suitable depository of this dispensing and regulating power, than the Bishop of each Diocese, who knows best its wants, has most of the confidence of its clergy, and may be presumed to be the most prudent. Nay, we would not give even to him unlimited liberty in this matter, but only within certain bounds, to be

specified by the General Convention; yet sufficient to allow of his authorizing in his clergy, such use of the Prayer Book, and only of it, as may lead most effectually to the use of the *whole* of it in due time everywhere.

I speak from what I know of the state of things among us, as to both our negro population and our poor whites in this Diocese.

As to the *poorer classes of white* people, especially in our middle and upper districts, through the long remissness of our Church in our low country, the other portions of our state have been preoccupied for generations by the Methodists and Baptists. Hence has sprung up a rank growth of prejudice against forms of prayer, preaching from written sermons, a salaried ministry, &c.; and our Church has, in consequence, been able hitherto to gain a footing in these regions scarcely anywhere, except in villages and country towns, where are settlers from "the low country," who were Episcopalians before, or where are other persons of more than ordinary intelligence and education; while in the country places, among the rural population, it has proved to be an almost hopeless task to introduce our services; *i. e.* in their integrity. Yet I am persuaded, that if a clergyman were permitted to go among the people, and on assembling them, to begin with a hymn, use a few collects, the Confession, Lord's Prayer, a chapter of the Bible, and preach an extempore sermon, he would, in a little while, dispose them to receive more

and more of the service, till in due season, by judicious explanations, he would bring them to join in the whole of it.

As to *our slaves*—they may be distinguished into *plantation* and *town* negroes; whose respective circumstances, as respects this matter of religion, differ materially, and call for different treatment.

The *plantation* negroes are under a patriarchal government; each set of them under their respective owners, who can select for them such pastor as he may please, and keep them in general from other religious teaching as effectually as he can his own children. And, as most of the planters in our low country are Episcopalians, it follows that their people come under the pastoral care of our clergy, who have free access to them during the week, as well as on Sundays; and who, in many cases, are aided by owners in teaching them. Hence it comes to pass that, on such plantations, it is comparatively easy to introduce our Church service almost entire, by using the same "selection" for months together, till the people become familiar with it. Yet, even among these people, it is found advisable to use often other than the Lesson for the day; and, as the congregations are generally on only the afternoons or evenings, to use then some of the *Morning* Service; particularly the Commandments and the second Lessons for the mornings, as these are from the Gospels, while those of the afternoons are from the Epistles—a part of Scripture less intelligible to untutored minds.

Our *city* negroes are a different set. Living within reach of places of worship of all denominations, and being from under the eye of the owner, as soon as they are out of his yard, they possess as much of liberty almost as free persons, in the choice of the denomination with which they will connect themselves. And through the praiseworthy zeal of the Methodists, they have become, most of them, connected with that denomination: so much so, that the religious phraseology and modes of thought of our negroes generally, in this city, are of that school. This brings with it a necessity on our part, of approaching them with some degree of accommodation, familiarizing them gradually with our responsive service and more sober style of preaching, and indulging them in the use of as much of *singing* as we can find a place for in our public worship. Under these circumstances, having to commend our Church to a people, of whom very few can read, or can be taught to read, or be at Church in the *morning* of Sunday, we do very earnestly desire some such authorized modification of our ritual as will enable us to render it more acceptable to them, while not departing in the least from its spirit, or altering a word of its Prayer Book. And our Bishop, we think, is the one with whom might most safely be deposited the discretion requisite to meet this desire.

(e.) Remarks above, on (f.), imply affirmative opinion on *this* head, and indeed I do not see how it can be otherwise than that they who go as missionaries, whether domestic or foreign, and whether among a people

nominally heathen, or, though called Christians, yet strangers to our mode of worship, if not to our faith, must depart from rubrical exactness—so that the only question would seem to be whether the modes and measures of departure be left to individual discretion, or to *Episcopal* or *Conventional* prescription, and whether by *tacit* understanding or by *express* recognition. I know it is claimed by many that *even now* our clergy have to the full this right of rubrical irregularity, on the ground that the Rubrics prescribe only what shall be the order of service in *established* congregations. And I do not mean to deny that this is so *to a certain extent*, *i. e.* that the Rubrics are not binding where it would be plainly against common sense, because fatal to spiritual good, to keep to them, as where there is *no one* to respond. But I do say that, inasmuch as it scarcely can be hoped that all of our clergy will possess discretion, it is desirable that the question of departure should rest for decision with some person or persons of superior wisdom. Not absolutely with the General Convention, inasmuch as *it* cannot be adequately able to judge of varying exigencies, occurring remotely; though it may be the body by which may most properly be established certain *general* principles and outlines; to be reduced, however, to rules, and the details filled up by either Diocesan action, or Episcopal in missionary stations. Thence, I presume, would spring up sundry forms of service in different missions; *e. g.* the African, the Chinese, the Indian, the Negro; differing somewhat in

phraseology and in arrangement, but on the model of, and in doctrinal harmony with, our Prayer Book. Nor do I see that any harm would come of such diversity so regulated; while without it there may be license, less safe, because more unrestrained.

2. I think they *should;* at least so long as Canons VII. of 1850, and XIV. of 1853, are in force; unless Bishop De Lancey's project of "provinces" be adopted, in which case, among the modifications of our legislation might be, perhaps wisely, some permission of admission of persons to holy orders, with a view to the peculiar wants of specific spheres of labour. But, if so, it would follow that Bishops and Standing Committees should have more discretion in excluding from their respect Dioceses, for other reasons than such as would warrant ecclesiastical trial. And I apprehend that, unless the General Convention will have regard to the wants of our Church, not only in our chief cities, but in our less cultivated communities, and will legislate for not only a learned clergy, but also an efficient body of practical evangelists, the call for more liberty from the Dioceses will be imperative.

3, 4, and 5. To these I answer No: to the first of them, from decided objection to any further relaxation; to the other two, merely from ignorance of any such instances as are there sought for.

6. Dr. Muhlenberg has proved that they are not: vide his Exposition (36–38).

7. That she "ought" is clear, if she can: but *how* she *is to*, may be more than most of us can see or say.

Still it is conceivable that, by the earnest and united persuasions of pastors, and especially of Bishops, the members generally of our Church may be waked up to feel the importance of Christianizing education—and in order thereto of founding "Church Schools" in connexion with parishes and Dioceses—for which purpose we may derive invaluable hints from our English brethren. Moreover in "Church Homes" and Hospitals, of which there are already specimens in our own country, females may be trained, who will do, from love to Christ and to his people, the kindly offices which now are done by hired nurses. But success in so desirable an undertaking can scarcely be hoped for without a general agreement of opinion and combination of effort, nor without liberal contributions of money for endowments, which will enable denominational schools of any sort to compete with those of the state, or even of private enterprise, not so connected with ecclesiastical associations, and therefore not so much opposed by sectarian jealousy.

8. Undoubtedly. Many of our pious women have "leisure," and more of it too than they know what do with, and are even suffering instead from that *ennui*, which is at once the cause and the effect of conscious uselessness; not always from want of "inclination," but often from their really not knowing how to set to work and what to do. Many of them are, but many more might be, Sunday School teachers. By their Working Societies, Fuel Societies, Shoe Societies, &c., numbers are caring efficiently for

the poor in our cities; and we do not see why there may not be such in every large parish, and in most of the smaller ones in our large towns, and even in rural districts. According to suggestions in the first part of this communication, they may render material aid to their pastors. Nor does there seem to be any sufficient reason why such "sisterhoods" as are found useful among Protestants in Europe, and to some extent also in our own country, may not be introduced among us, though not without modifications thoughtfully considered to adapt them to our circumstances, and to guard them against those abuses, to which all such associations are liable.

Tendering with great deference, and with much hesitation, these probably superfluous suggestions, and hoping and praying that something practical may be elaborated by the wisdom of those Reverend Fathers who have this matter under consideration, I am, very respectfully,

PAUL TRAPIER.

May 4th, 1855.

DR. VAN DEUSEN'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Rt. Rev. James H. Otey, D. D., Chairman of the Commission on the Memorial.

Reverend and Dear Sir:—

I send you a few thoughts in reply to the inquiries of the Commission of Bishops, which have suggested themselves, in considering the important subjects to which those questions relate. I must say at the outset, that I have never looked upon the original Memorial with any very great favour, but have felt that it proceeded from that love of novelty and change, which, sheltering itself under the plea that we must keep pace with the progress of the age, and accommodate the agencies of the Church to the existing state of society, would part with all that is old and venerable, and substitute something that is new, to arrest attention and win the people to her embrace. At the same time I am very far from thinking the human instrumentalities of the Church are perfect; and would gladly see some improvements made, which would not

affect her fixed system and principles. I will therefore make known some of my views, in the form of answers to the questions, in the order that they occur.

I.

1. While I do not complain of the present mode of preparing young men for the ministry in respect "to learning, piety, or intellectual power," I think there could be some improvement in the way of practical efficiency. Our candidates need, what students of law and medicine enjoy, intercourse with faithful and judicious pastors whilst "visiting the sick, as well as the whole, within their cures;" meeting difficult cases of conscience; imparting oral instruction to the various classes that compose our congregations—indeed in the discharge of all their ordinary private duties. They need opportunities of seeing their manner of approaching men—dealing with them—and that every-day life of a faithful rector, which would enable one to mould his own character, from his standard of duty in those things not explicitly enjoined, and become an able minister of the New Testament.

2. I think we need more *earnestness* and *directness*, and less fear of becoming *methodistical* and *enthusiastic*. But I hear so little preaching, that I feel a delicacy in expressing myself upon this point.

3. By visits from house to house; inquiries into their condition; kindness to themselves and their children; gathering them into Sunday and parochial schools; providing for their wants when in poverty and

sickness; welcoming them to our Churches, or holding services for them when too distant; and by that general civility, attention, and care, which will show that we sympathize with them, and take an interest in their temporal and spiritual welfare.

4. Yes.

5. No plan at present suggests itself.

6. In regard to family training and instruction, I fear that there is very little to be found that looks to religious ends. And the ministry must therefore urge the duty both publicly and privately. The Sunday School is deficient because so generally intrusted to *lay* control—whereas the rector should be with his Sunday School as regularly as with his congregation. During a ministry of fourteen years, I have never had a superintendent, but opened and closed my school, taken a general supervision, and taught the oldest class; and yet been able to perform my other Sunday labours without much inconvenience or fatigue. This constant attendance brings the rector in connexion with all his children, and attaches them to him personally, and through him to the truths and principles he inculcates. In regard to catechising, it is feared, it is very little practised; and parents do not see that their children attend, when it is practised.

7. I have never yet been able to see the necessity or propriety of opening our Churches at different hours, except when they were crowded, and some were excluded.

8. I endeavour to take charge of all large girls and

boys—when they have passed through the lower classes —and thus make a position in this higher class an honour, to which all my children are taught to aspire.

9. This is a difficult question. They do not co-operate as they should; yet it is not easy to suggest a remedy. A disposition to do good will always find opportunities. But it is feared the duty of co-operation is not realized; and the ministry must teach this as they do other religious obligations.

10. By securing the true spirit of the Gospel; and that intercourse will necessarily follow.

11. Yes. By proper parental training, and habits of attendance in early life; by special attention from the clergy in the way of civilities, kind inquiries, visits, and instructions from the pulpit; recommending suitable books for reading; interesting them in the various works and labours of the Church, by finding something for them to do, and proposing certain ends to be accomplished, and so presenting Christianity, that they may be drawn and persuaded, rather than alienated and repelled.

12 and 13. I know no better means than a constant repetition in public and private, of those considerations which the Gospel sets forth for accomplishing these objects, showing the success of persevering effort, and urging their duties by the power of our own example in doing the work of reclaiming others, and showing an indifference to the things of this world.

II.

1. Not in language—but as suggested.

(a.) Shortening and dividing.

(b.) Yes.

(c.) Yes.

(d.) Yes.

(e.) Yes.

(f.) I can see no special need of change in this respect.

2. Yes.

3. No.

(a.) No.

(b.) No.

4. No.

5. No.

6. I do not feel qualified to answer, though I think not.

7. Yes.

8. Yes.

I have thus given you general replies; because to have entered into particulars, would have required much time and labour, and this was not desired by the Commission, as I understand their object to be to get a general expression of *opinion* upon certain subjects, rather than *dissertations* upon them. I have long felt disposed, when hearing the system and varied appliances of the Church complained of, as imperfect and inefficient, to ask the question, have you tested them *thoroughly* and *faithfully?* Have you, as a *minister of God's Word*, done your duty, fulfilled

your ordination vows? or may not much of the good work left undone lie at your door? For one, I can say that I think that *we* are more deficient than the *means;* and that if we were more laborious, self-denying, humble, devout, and holy, a hundred-fold of fruit would be found, where now there is but thirty. We may have the most perfect system of means, the best adjusted machinery, but if they are not in the hands of a thorough workman—watchful, skilful, faithful, persevering, laborious—they will avail little. Let the ministry be less *worldly*, *contentious*, inconsistent, and unconcerned, about the true end of the Gospel, the salvation of souls, and carry out the whole working system of the Church, with some few modifications, and we might enjoy, it is humbly believed, a more abundant blessing.

Very respectfully and truly, yours,

EDWIN M. VAN DEUSEN.

Sept. 26th, 1854.

REV. DR. VINTON'S COMMUNICATION.

My Dear Brother:—

I beg to acknowledge your official note, inviting me to appear before the Committee of Bishops, who are considering "the Memorial."

I expect to leave town for Rhode Island to-day; and on my return next week, I would willingly, if requested, attempt an argument for the prayer of the Memorial

Meanwhile, let me say through you, that the Memorial prays for the removal of the restrictions of our Canon law, on the exercise of our Bishops' Apostolic power of Ordination. The restrictions relate chiefly to the use of the Prayer Book and adoption of the Articles of Religion. These are doubtless expedient for our Church; and yet they may be revoked by our General Convention. They are, therefore, of man's device, however wise and prudent they may be. They are of human authority, however sacred we may regard them.

Now the gift of Ordination is a Divine deposit, given

of Christ to our Bishops, for the world. Why should this Divine gift and trust, be withheld from those of the world who wish to obtain and enjoy it? Why should our Bishops be forced to refuse Ordination to any persons (fitly prepared and called inwardly) by reason of a human and revocable condition? Why should the human device be allowed to hinder the distribution of the Divine deposit? Why should man's law forbid the execution of the Divine command?

Our Bishops, like St. Paul, are "debtors" to the nations. Let them offer to ordain men to the ministry of the Catholic Church, requiring only conditions antecedent, which are Catholic. Our Liturgy and articles are not Catholic but provincial.

The Faith (*i. e.* the Creeds) are Catholic; the Sacraments are Catholic; the requirement of an inward call by the Holy Ghost is Catholic. These Catholic conditions are of God, and they should, therefore, be demanded as conditions precedent to Ordination.

I would, therefore, that our Bishops suffer no hindrance in ordaining to the Apostolic ministry those persons who are inwardly called, who receive the Creeds, and adhere to the two Sacraments. Other requirements frustrate the grace of Christ, so far as He required ministers to be sent and called as was Aaron. You cannot fulfil the Lord's will, while the Canons of our Church are left in their stiffness. I would not relax them, however, for the ministry of our branch of the Church Catholic, that is the Pro-

testant Episcopal Church in the United States. I would admit no man to the ministry thereof, but only such as accept *ex animo*, the requisites and conditions our laws impose. None other should minister over our parishes, or sit in our conventions, or share in our legislation.

It is not proposed to loosen any of the checks or bars under which we, as a Church, have prospered.

But I would admit ministers to the true Apostolic ministry, and let them serve congregations such as the Methodists and Presbyterians, &c. And I have such faith in the utility of a Liturgy, as to believe that its necessity and expediency would assert themselves. They who are made one with us in the Apostolic doctrine and fellowship, and in baptism and breaking of bread, would soon become harmonious with us in Common Prayers.

What causes the schism in the One Body of Christ?

I answer, the want of ordination among the *ministers* of the sects; and the want of confirmation by Apostolic hands among the members of the same.

Give Bishops, Priests, and Deacons to those sectarian denominations, and the schism in Christ's Body is at once healed. I say nothing of baptism, leaving lay baptism in its *mooted* position. But ordain the ministers according to the Memorial, and lay baptism ceases, or nearly so.

I remain yours affectionately,

Francis Vinton.

July 3d, 1854.

REV. J. F. YOUNG'S COMMUNICATION.

To the Rt. Rev. James H. Otey, D. D., Chairman of the Commission on the Memorial.

Right Reverend and Dear Sir:—

Although I have felt not a little interested in the matters involved in the "Memorial Movement," I had no thought of troubling you with any communication upon the subject; nor should I have done so, but for our conversation upon the matter when I had the pleasure of meeting you a short time since.

It is certainly not a little remarkable that the feeling which so extensively prevails in our Church, and has recently sought embodiment in the form of a Memorial to the House of Bishops, has pervaded simultaneously, and no less extensively, our mother Church of England, and striven to make itself a practical reality there, through the action of Convocation, and the appointment of a Commission precisely similar,

if I remember correctly, to the one recently appointed by our House of Bishops, the Chairman of which I now have the honour to address. Why is all this? It must be a serious and important want to make itself so widely felt, and so universally acknowledged, and which prays so importunately for relief to the Fathers and Rulers of the Church. The Church is acting wisely, most wisely, in my humble judgment, in that she is not turning a deaf ear to the demands of the times, as she has too often done, with the saddest consequences; but is thoughtfully and seriously inquiring how she can best provide for the wants of her children, and render most effective her various ministrations unto the salvation of a lost and perishing world.

The objection so strongly urged against this movement, by the more conservative portion of the Church, that it is radical and disorganizing, imperilling, if not the integrity of our Catholic faith, certainly the integrity of the Book of Common Prayer, and the established principles and practices of sound and well authorized *ritual use*, however it may, or may not hold in regard to *some features* of this movement (which it is not my present purpose to discuss), *does* NOT hold, I think, so far as respects more flexibility in the Prayer Book offices—a wider discretion in their use—and a better adaptation of them to the different seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year.

There is a very important fact bearing directly upon

this matter, to which I have seen no allusion made as yet, and to which it is the purpose of the present communication respectfully to invite your attention. It is, that *all* substantially which the Memorialists ask for, so far as respects the *worship* of the Church, not only can be granted by the warrant of the best ritual authorities, but would restore our offices much nearer to their original design and use, than is our present practice; and this too *by simply a few rubrical changes*, WITHOUT DISTURBING IN THE LEAST "THE PRAYER BOOK AS IT IS," OR CHANGING ONE WORD OF THE BODY OF ITS CONTENTS.

And it is a most striking proof of the wisdom and surpassing excellence of the original arrangements, that, after departing from them for a considerable time, the instincts and cravings of the widely extended communions of England and America should, without the slightest reference to any ritual antecedents, *and in utter unconsciousness of them generally*, demand such discretionary liberties in the use of the Prayer Book Offices as, if exercised, would in the most important respects restore them to what was the *obligatory* USE of the original Offices when ours were compiled from them. In this one fact lies the solution of all the difficulties with which the *ritual* portion of this movement is surrounded, as it seems to me, while from it we may derive the most salutary of all admonitions, that of personal experience, that we presume not to wander a single step farther than we have already

done from those venerable usages, which, as established in the originals of our Prayer Book Offices, were the result and embodiment of *fifteen centuries* of the Church's best learning, and study, and piety, and experience.

I have before me as I write, and from which chiefly I shall cite the proofs and illustrations of what I have said, a translation of "The Psalter, or Seven Ordinary Hours of Prayer, according to the use of the Illustrious and Excellent Church of Sarum," with "The Litany" and other Occasional Offices, together with "the more important variations of the York and Hereford Uses." These, as you are well aware, are the Offices, with their Rubrics, Anthems, Hymns, &c., out of which our Prayer Book was compiled, and which every one who would understand the rationale of the same, would be interested and instructed by carefully studying.

What is sought for by the Memorialists in the matter of Divine worship may be embraced for the most part, I believe, under two heads.

First, *More flexibility in the Prayer Book Offices, and freedom in their use.*

Secondly, *Their fuller adaptation to the Festivals and Fasts, and closer general sympathy with the changes of the ritual year.*

The means very generally suggested, and acquiesced in, for attaining what is specified under the first head, are, I believe, the separate use, and different combinations of the Morning and Evening Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion.

To make it the more manifest when and how far this may be done in accordance with ancient precedent, allow me to remark very briefly upon the specific origin of our Offices, and to cite a few of the more important Rubrics which regulated the use, and therefore indicate the scope of their Originals; not, I scarcely need say, for the purpose of communicating information upon a subject respecting which I would gladly learn of you, but *as the necessary basis of what I have to say.*

The Offices for the Seven Daily Hours of Prayer, and the times for their use respectively, were, as you well know, Matins, from after midnight, or "very early in the morning while it was yet dark;" Lauds, at the breaking of day; Prime, at 6 A. M., or between that and 9 A. M.; Terce, at 9, or between that and 12; Sext, at 12, or between that and 3 P. M.; None, at 3, or between that and 6; Vespers, at sunset, or between that and 9; and Compline, or Completorium, at bedtime. But after the persecutions of the Christians ceased, and with them the occasion for nocturnal assemblages, it appears that Matins and Lauds (and Prime, after it was instituted), to which was sometimes added Terce, came to be said BY AGGREGATION, as one continued Morning Office.

Now, of this aggregated office our Morning Prayer is a careful and exact compendium, as the following comparative synopsis will show:—

ANCIENT ENGLISH OFFICES.			REVISED OFFICE
MATINS.	LAUDS.	PRIME.	MORNING PRAYER.
In the Name - -	Verse & Response	In the Name - -	Sentences.
			Exhortation.
(*Privately*)		[See below] - - -	Conf. Absol.
Our Father - -	- - - - - - - -	Our Father (*Priv.*)	Our Father.
O Lord, open - -	- - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - -	O Lord, open.
O God, make - -	O God, make - -	O God, make - -	O God, make.
Glory be - - - -	Glory be - - - -	Glory be - - - -	Glory be.
Alleluia - - - -	Alleluia - - -	Alleluia - - -	Praise ye / The Lord's Name.
or Praise be - -	*or* Praise be - -	*or* Praise be -	
Invitatory Anthem			
Ps. Venite - - -	- - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - -	Ps. Venite.
Hymn		Hymn	
12. Pss. 6. Ants. -	5. Pss. & Ants. -	3. Pss. 1. Ant. - -	Psalms.
(S. 18. Pss. 9. Ants.)	(S. Jubilate) - -	(S. 9. Pss. 1. Ant.)	(in course.)
Glorias - - - -	Glorias - - - -	Glorias - - - -	Glorias.
Antiphon - - -	Antiphon - - -	Antiphon	
Benedictions			
A lection of 3 or 9 Lessons - - / O. T. N. T. Hom. / Responsaries -	- - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - -	First Lesson / Old Test.
(S. Te Deum) -	- - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - -	Te Deum.
	Canticle - - - -	Athan. Creed	*or*
	(S. Benedicite) -	- - - - - - - -	Benedicite.
	Short Chapter - -	Short Chapter - -	Second Less. N. T.
	Hymn		
	Benedictus - - -	- - - - - - - -	Benedictus.
	[See above] - - -	- - - - - - - -	Jubilate.
		[See above] - - -	Athan. Creed
		[See below] - - -	*or* Ap. Creed.
	The Lord be - -	- - - - - - - -	The Lord be.
	Let us pray - -	Petitions and / Short Litany -	Let us pray. / Short Litany.
		Our Father - - -	Our Father.
		Ap. Creed - - -	
		Petitions - - -	Petitions.
		Conf. Absol. - -	
	Collect for Day -	- - - - - - - -	Collect for Day.
	Collect for Peace -	- - - - - - - -	Collect for Peace.
		Collect for Grace -	Collect for Grace.
		Intercessions - -	Intercessions.
			Thanksgiving.
		Benediction - -	Benediction.
Short Chap. at Terce (Sunday), 2 Cor. xiii. 14. "The grace"			"The grace"

The dotted lines in the above show from which of the old Offices the parts of our own are derived. S. signifies Sunday.

I have taken the English Prayer Book for the comparison, rather than our own, for the sake of brevity

and simplicity, it being a little nearer to the originals, as I shall do likewise when I come to speak of the Evening Prayer.

At the end of Terce, of which the last sentence in our Morning Prayer is the representative, it being, as appears above, the Sunday Capitulum, or Short Lesson, in that Office, on the *week days* of Lent, the xv. Gradual Psalms (cxx. to cxxxiv. inclusive) were said, followed by the Litany.*

Immediately after Terce commonly followed the Liturgy, or Communion Office, though sometimes it came before Terce. The next office in order is Sext, and after *this* sometimes came the Communion. Next was None, at the end of which (as at the end of Terce daily), on the *Wednesdays* and *Fridays* of Lent, the Litany was said. *Here* sometimes, instead of after Terce or Sext, followed the office for the Holy Communion. Yet, differing from all the foregoing, on Christmas Day, when there were three celebrations of the Eucharist, one took place at the end of Matins immediately after the Te Deum, and the others at later hours.†

* "Here, on week-days in Quadragesima (beginning with the Monday after the first Sunday), the xv. Gradual Psalms followed by the Litany, until Wednesday before Easter, inclusive." —*Trans. Sarum Psalt. Rub.* at the end of Terce, p. 134.

† "On all Simple Sundays, *i. e.* which were not Feast days, the Communion office came after Terce.

On Week-days it was generally at the same hour. But on the first Monday in Advent it was *before* Terce. In Lent it

The Roman rule in this matter differs somewhat from the old English use, and still further illustrates, therefore—what I am endeavouring to prove to be legitimately and safely attainable—flexibility and freedom in combining and using the different Offices of the Church, according to the varying exigencies of times and occasions.*

I refer to the authorities of the Roman Church, not, of course, as authority for us, except so far as they go towards making up the consent of Christendom touching any particular matter, but merely to show that

was after None, except in Feasts, when the Communion Service for the Feast came *before Terce.*

On Christmas-Day there were three different celebrations: one after Te Deum in Matins; another after [Prime?] and another after Terce."—*Derived from the Consuetudinary of Sarum, and given in the Trans. of the Sar. Psalt.* p. 439.

* "Missa privata saltem post Matutinum et Laudes quâcumque horâ ab aurora usque ad meridiem dici potest.

"Missa autem conventualis et solemnis sequenti ordine dici debet. In festis Duplicibus, et Semiduplicibus, in Dominicis, et infra Octavas, dictâ in choro Horâ Tertiâ. In festis Simplicibus, et feriis per annum dictâ Sextâ. In Adventu, Quadragesima, Quatuor Temporibus, etiam infra Octavam Pentacostes, et vigiliis quæ jejunantur, quamvis sint dies solemnes, Missa de Tempore debet cantari post Nonam." * *

"Excipiuntur ab hoc ordine dicendi Missam conventualem Missæ in Nativitate Domini, quarum prima dicitur post mediam noctem, finito Te Deum laudamus, in Matutino, secunda in aurora, dictis Laudibus et Primâ, tertia verò in die post Tertiam, vel ubi aliter ex dispensatione apostolica disponatur."

Rub. Gen. Miss. XV. (*De hora celebrandi Missam*)

our *one*, *rigid*, and *unvarying time* and *manner* of using each of our Prayer Book Offices, is in direct contrariety to the practice of the whole of the Western Church, besides our own Communion; as I shall presently show it to be a departure from *the original practice of the* REFORMED CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

I would remark further, in regard to the lesser or mid-day Hours, that they could be said, when circumstances required it, by aggregation, at any one of the hours between Prime and Vespers inclusive. When said, it was in their entireness, as a general rule, including, of course, Penitential Psalms, Litanies, Festal Commemorations, and Special Prayers, as they pertained to one or other Office for the day or season.

We come next to Vespers and Compline, the sources of our Evening Prayer, and can best show its relation to them by an analytical table, similar to what was just given to illustrate the origin of our Morning Prayer.

EARLY ENGLISH OFFICES.		REVISED OFFICE.
VESPERS.	COMPLINE.	EVENING PRAYER.
In the Name - - - -	In the Name - - - -	Sentences.
		Exhortation.
	[See below] - - - - -	Conf. Absolution.
	Turn Thou us	
Our Father (*Priv.*) - -	Our Father (*Priv.*) - -	Our Father.
		O Lord, open.
O God, make - - - -	O God, make - - - -	O God, make.
5. Pss. & Ants. - - -	4 Pss. 1 Ant. - - - -	The Psalms.
Glorias - - - - - -	Glorias - - - - - -	Glorias.
Short chapter - - - -	- - - - - - - - - -	First Lesson.
Hymn		Psalm xcviii. *or*
Magnificat - - - - -	- - - - - - - - - -	Magnificat.
	Short Chapter - - - -	Second Lesson.
	Hymn - - - - - - -	Ps. lxvii. *or*
	Nunc Dimittis - - - -	Nunc Dimittis.
	[See below] - - - - -	Ap. Creed.
Short Litany - - - -	Short Litany - - - -	Short Litany.
Our Father - - - - -	Our Father - - - - -	Our Father.
Petitions - - - - - -	Petitions - - - - - -	Petitions.
	Conf. Absolution - - -	
Collect for Day - - -	- - - - - - - - - -	Collect for Day.
Collect for Peace - - -	- - - - - - - - - -	Collect for Peace.
	Collect for Aid - - - -	Collect for Aid.
	Intercessions - - - -	Intercessions.
		Thanksgiving.
	Benediction - - - - -	Benediction.
	Our Father.	
	Ap. Creed.	

These Offices, as well as those for the morning, were often said by aggregation in practical use, of which, as appears from the foregoing table, our Evening Prayer is a no less admirable compendium than is the Morning Prayer of Matins, Lauds, and Prime. And it here occurs to me to suggest that in providing for two Evening Offices, which are so greatly needed in our Church, a reference to the old arrangement may afford valuable aid. Not that anything should be allowed to supersede our present Office when there is but one evening service, as it is undoubtedly the best aggrega-

tion of the two that could possibly be devised, to say nothing of the strong hold which it has, in its present form, upon the affections and associations of our people, which is enough, of itself, to counterbalance *many* minor reasons for change, even did they exist.

Towards the end of Vespers, as also of Lauds (just where the Versicles stand after the Creed, and before the Collect for the day, in our Morning and Evening Prayer), on the week days of Advent and Lent, and upon Ember days certain "Preces" (Penitential versicles), ending at Lauds with Ps. 130, "Out of the deep," &c., and at Vespers with the 51st Psalm, "Have mercy upon me," &c., were said, according to the more common ritual usage, which were followed immediately by the Collect for the day, and any special Commemoration of the time, as with us during Advent and Lent. In the Sarum use, however, these same Petitions, ending always with the 51st Psalm, were said not only at Lauds and Vespers, but at Terce, Sext, and None, in the Week-day Office for the greater part of the Year.*

* "These petitions[1] are to be said thus: at Matins, Terce, Sext, None, and Vespers, in all week-days throughout Advent, and from the First Sunday after the Octave of the Epiphany to the Supper of the Lord [Thursday before Easter], and from the First Sunday after Trinity to the Advent of the Lord, in the ordinary weekly service, except at Matins on Wednesday and Friday, and Saturday of the Four Times of Advent, and except at Vespers, from 'O Sapientia' to the last 'O' inclusive." [December 16th to 25th.]—*Tr. Sar. Psalt.* p. 173.

[1] See Appendix A.

Next after the Offices for the Seven Hours follow the Collects for the year, then the Penitential Psalms, of which much more account seems formerly to have been made than now by us. A column of Rubrics precedes them, prescribing the times for their use, among which were,—after sermon at Sext on Ash-Wednesday, and after the Office for each of the Seven Hours, one, in regular order, thus going through them daily during Lent.

Finally, so far as concerns our present purpose, we come to "The Greater Litany,"—the original of our own—in six parts, one for each day of the week (except Sunday) during Lent, the first four petitions, or invocations of the Trinity preceding each portion, except on Holy Saturday, the vigil of Easter. From the page of Rubrics prefacing it, I transcribe such passages as prescribe the times of its use.*

* "The Litany, preceded by the xv. Gradual Psalms * * was said for all the people of God, after Terce in the Week-days of Quadragesima, *i. e.* from Monday after the first Sunday to Wednesday before Easter inclusive, all without note. But besides this, on every Wednesday and Friday in Quadragesima * * after None * * was said the Litany."

* * * * * * *

"On Monday, in Rogations, after None, the usual Procession took place from the Cathedral to some Church in the city; in the end of which, preceded by the Seven Penitential Psalms, was said the full Litany, with the Petitions and Prayers, without note, unless it was a Festival, when it was otherwise. On Tuesday and Wednesday in Rogations the same took place, except that the Litanies then used varied in the invocations and

To this cursory glance at the various times of using and modes of combining the ancient Offices of the Church, of which ours are the legitimate offspring, I need not add a word by way of applying to our present circumstances the deductions which are obvious, at first thought, from the facts exhibited. We have seen the Offices for all the Hours used separately, or combined with others—the Litany and Gradual Psalms, and the Litany and Penitential Psalms, sometimes combined with the Morning Offices, sometimes with the Evening, and sometimes used as a distinct Service—while we find the Eucharistic Office, complete in itself, sometimes following immediately upon Matins, at the end of Te Deum, sometimes at Terce, or Sext, or None, before or after, with or without the Litany and Penitential Psalms, as they pertained to the Season or the Office, which it immediately preceded or followed. What further sanction than the common consent and *law* of all western Christendom can our High Churchmen possibly desire, to warrant the separate use, or every *possible* combination, if need be, of the Morning and Evening Prayer, Litany and Communion Office, as the different seasons suggest, and our varying circumstances and necessities require, so long as not one sentence of Rubric or Canon forbids us this freedom, and, as can be easily shown, the

musical notation, and were chanted. Besides these, Litanies were chanted in procession at other times: as for favourable weather, in time of pestilence, for peace, in famine, or for other causes."—*Trans. Sarum. Psalt.* p. 406.

early practice of the Church of England abundantly sanctions it?

Although all references for you are quite unnecessary, so familiar are you with this whole subject, I cannot forbear writing out a few authorities, which, it seems to me, must be conclusive with every candid mind.

To say nothing of the proof which the Offices themselves afford, by their very construction and fulness, that they were designed for separate use, it may be seen by reference to the first three editions of the English Prayer Book, that the following Rubric stands at the beginning of the Office for the Holy Communion. "So many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate over night, or else in the morning afore the beginning of Morning Prayer, or immediately after"—the last clause showing that there was an interval between Morning Prayer and Holy Communion.

At the head of the Commination Office in all the editions of the Prayer Book, from 1549 to 1662 (the date of the last revision), stands the following Rubric: "After Morning Prayer, the people being called together by the ringing of a bell, and assembled in church, the English Litany shall be said after the accustomed manner, which ended," &c., showing that there was an interval between the Morning Prayer and Litany.

Mr. Jebb, an acknowledged authority in the ritual matters of the Church of England, says: "The origi-

nal custom of the Church, Eastern and Western, was to celebrate the Matins and the Communion at different hours. Such is still the custom at the Cathedrals of Winchester, Worcester, and Hereford, at the College of Winchester, and, as Wheatly informs us, formerly at Merton College, Oxford; and tradition gives the same account of Canterbury, and possibly of many other places. It would appear from passages in Archbishop Grindal's Life, that the same custom prevailed in the Diocese of York, till altered by his authority.*

Heylyn says: "This was the ancient practice of the Church of England. The Morning Prayer or Matins, to begin between six and seven; the second service or Communion-service, not till nine or ten, which distribution still continues in the Cathedral Church of Winchester, in that of Southwell, and perhaps some others."†

That the Litany was used as a distinct Office, is likewise abundantly manifest. The Rubric prefacing it in the Prayer Book of 1549 prescribes that, "upon Wednesdays and Fridays the English Litany shall be said or sung in all places, after such form as is appointed by the King's Majesty's injunctions."

In the xlviii. of Elizabeth's injunctions, 1559, it was ordered "that weekly, upon Wednesdays and Fridays, not being holy-days, the curate, at the accustomed hours of service shall resort to church, and

* Choral Service, p. 227.

† Antidotum, Part iii. 61.

cause warning to be given to the people by knolling of a bell, and say the Litany and prayers,"* *i. e.* apparently, the prayers which were printed at the end of the Litany. See Grindal, below.

Bishop Davies, of St. Asaph, orders, 1561, "That the Parsons, Vicars, and Curates, or one of them in every of their churches, do come together on Wednesdays and Fridays, being not holy-days, and then devoutly sing and say the Litany."†

Grindal, as Archbishop of York, prescribed, 1571, "the Litany and other prayers appointed for the day," on Wednesdays and Fridays in the forenoon, and Evening Prayer "every Saturday and holy-even."‡

Bishop Montague, of Norwich, 1638, asks, "Doth [your Minister] upon Wednesdays and Fridays ordinarily, and at other extraordinary times, appointed by the Ordinary, read and pray the Litany?"§

Proctor, in his treatise on the Common Prayer, says, "The English Litany was originally intended to be a distinct Office. It was put forth as a separate book by Henry VIII."‖ "The Litany is generally used by itself on the occasion of a Confirmation."¶

That the Office for the Holy Communion may be used as a distinct service, we need not go beyond our own Prayer Book for proof. The Rubric at the begin-

* Doc. Ann. I. 196.
† Wilkins, Concilia. iv. 229.
‡ Remains. 123.
§ Doc. Ann. ii, p. 68.
‖ Hist. and Rationale, 229.
¶ Ibid. Note, 230.

ning of this Office provides that "the Lord's Prayer may be omitted *if* Morning Prayer hath been said immediately before," which implies, of course, that it *may not* have been said immediately before.

As indicating the time when the change from the earlier usage of the Church of England took place, the instrumentality by which it was effected, and the authority therefore on which the later usage rests, I cannot forbear adding the injunction of Grindal, Archbishop of York, put forth in 1571, in which he directs the clergy "not to pause or stay between Morning Prayer, Litany, or Communion; but to continue and say Morning Prayer, Litany, and Communion (or the service appointed to be read when there is no Communion), together without any intermission."* "In the same Archbishop's articles for Canterbury," "he forbids ringing between Morning Prayer and the Litany."†

The injunctions of an Archbishop of the Church of England, "whose early foreign training, as is evident from many circumstances of his life, had incapacitated him from a sufficiently discriminative estimate of our Liturgy,"‡ are the authority, as it thus appears, on which rests our present practice, over against which may be set the general usage of all Western, and indeed Eastern Christendom up to that time, and the absence of all legislation, confirming such injunctions

* Life of Grindal, Bk. ii. chap. 2.

† Robertson on the Liturgy, p. 129.

‡ Jebb. 227.

as the Church's law, either in England or America, up to this hour.

The conclusion, therefore, to which we are brought as the summary of the whole matter is, that "*as the practice of uniting the services began so early, and has not been censured or discountenanced by the later revisers of the Prayer Book, we need not doubt that it is sufficiently sanctioned;* WHILE, ON THE OTHER HAND, IT IS EVIDENT THAT A DISTINCTNESS WAS ORIGINALLY PROVIDED FOR, AND STILL REMAINS LAWFUL."*

But notwithstanding the abundant authorities adduced (to which many more might be added), both from ancient ritual precedent and the earlier use of the Reformed Church of England, for the separate use of the Prayer Book Offices, there yet remains a difficulty to be met before we can attain what is desirable in the matter of their flexibility.

It is not to be supposed that ecclesiastical antecedents, or even legislative enactments, will make our people satisfied with foregoing one-half of the service to which they have been accustomed on the Lord's day, and which is generally, and rightly felt not to be too great a "sacrifice of praise" to be offered on that holy day to the Father of Mercies and God of all Comfort. Nor in country parishes, which are, and ever will be, the great majority in our Church, is it practicable for the people to assemble at different

* Robertson on the Liturgy, p. 129.

hours on Sunday morning for Morning Prayer and Holy Communion.

It is therefore well worthy of consideration whether the omission of certain parts of the Offices of Morning Prayer and Holy Communion might not be left to the discretion of the minister when the two are to concur on Communion Sunday.

As the matter now stands, we have several Exhortations, general Confessions, general Supplications, and general Thanksgivings. Two Lessons from the Old Testament (including the Decalogue), three from the Gospels (including the summary after the Decalogue), and one from the Epistles. There is the Exhortation and Confession at the beginning of Morning Prayer—the greater general Confession and Supplication of the Litany—another general Supplication in the Prayer for the Church Militant—another general Exhortation immediately following—another general Confession—still another in the Prayer of Humble Access, and then the crowning climax of all confession, supplication, and thanksgiving, in the whole Eucharistic Service. Is there not obviously a redundancy here which could be curtailed without essential loss, when these Offices, each of which is so full and complete for separate use, are brought together and virtually compacted into one?

The Exhortations with which our Offices abound, as you well know, were no part of their originals; nor was the Decalogue recited in the Communion Office till 1552. The first were necessary at the time they

were inserted, because of the deficiency of preaching and ignorance of the clergy; and the second, as well as the first, because of the *gross* ignorance of the people. These causes, which furnished such abundant reasons for the additions then made to the ancient Offices, happily do not now exist to any such extent as they did then. Suppose then the redundancy *in these particulars* be curtailed, or the use of it be made discretional. This would meet the wishes of the Memorialists in a way not justly obnoxious to the strictest of Ritualists. One could then begin with the Lord's Prayer, and, following the present order of the Morning Prayer to the transition to the Litany, if it were to be said, go through with that to the end of the Prayer, "We humbly beseech Thee," &c., thence to the Collect for Purity in the Communion Office, and from that, passing over the Decalogue, to the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, for the Day. Or, if the Litany were not to be said, at the place of transition, taking instead of it the Collect for Purity, then that for the Day, &c., as before. The special advantage of this arrangement is, that, while it abbreviates considerably the Morning Office, it preserves the integrity of what constituted the *original* Offices, and gives occasion for no confusion or embarrassment of the congregation from uncertainty as to the posture to be assumed in anticipation of what is to follow. Whether the Minister should take the Litany, or Collect for Purity, at the end of the Prayer for the President, would make no difference, for the congregation are already kneeling;

and whether he should begin to rehearse the Commandments, or to recite the Collect for the Day, is to them the same, for still they are kneeling, in posture for either, and can make no response till something is uttered for them to respond to. An arrangement of this sort, or at any rate upon this principle, would undoubtedly rid us of some redundancy, and compact our Offices into a better unity when used as one. It might be objected, I know, to such an order, that it would confound the distinction between the Offices of Morning Prayer and Holy Communion, which had better be preserved. Would it not the rather be virtually an expansion backwards of the Ante-Communion Office, or the making of that and the Morning Prayer united one great Ante-Communion Office? For the Liturgy proper begins with the Sursum Corda, and all that precedes this is but preparatory to it.*

In confirmation of the general idea contained in this suggestion, I quote the Rubric at the end of the Communion Office in the English Prayer Book of 1549.†

"When the Holy Communion is celebrate on the work day, or in private houses: Then may be omitted the Gloria in Excelsis, the Creed, the Homily, and the Exhortation, beginning, "Dearly beloved," &c.

* Missa Solemnis semper dicitur post aliquam Horam, etiam in nocte Nativitatis Domini: ut Horæ Canonicæ sint quasi quædam ad Missam præparatio.—*Gavantus. Thes. Sacr. Rit.* tom. i. p. 112.

† Lit. of Ed. VI., p. 95, Parker Edit.

A few words upon one or two matters of detail, with your permission, while speaking of what is attainable in the way of flexibility.

I believe there is no one thing, unimportant as it may be in itself, that is such a clog to the freedom and life of our services as the Exhortation before the General Confession. It is very well for use once a week, say, when a large congregation, consisting in part of undevout and perhaps *very* occasional worshippers, demand something of the sort to call their attention to the duty of worship, and render it therefore appropriate and effective; but to be bound to its perpetual repetition, fourteen times every week, and twelve of these times to the devout few who not only understand their duty in this particular, but have torn themselves away from "the cares of this world" for the *express purpose* of performing it, and nothing else, is, to say the least, quite unnecessary.

Now why could not the Rubric after the Sentences of Scripture be altered on this wise?

Then shall the Minister say,

Let us humbly confess our sins unto Almighty God,

or else

"Dearly beloved brethren," &c., as now.

This would relieve the difficulty, and with it all objections to the introductory portion of our Morning and Evening Offices. It would be strictly analogous to the bidding before the prayer for the Church Militant in our Communion Office—"Let us pray for the," &c., &c. And if further authority be desired by any

it may be found in the York Offices, where, before the Confession of which ours is the amplification, may be seen, instead of our long Exhortation, the following,

V. "Let us confess unto the Lord, for He is good.

R. And His mercy endureth for ever."*

This same verse and response stand before the Confession in the Communion Office in *all* the English Uses of Sarum, Bangor, York, and Hereford, and are peculiarly English; as nothing of the sort stands before the Roman Confiteor, either in the Daily Offices, or Mass.

It would often be preferable, however, because more simple and less formal, when but a few devout persons are assembled, to begin the Morning and Evening Offices with the Lord's Prayer, as was the usage from time immemorial in the Church of England till the revision of 1552. And a few words added to the first Rubric are all that is necessary to provide for this.

I would respectfully suggest, likewise, whether the constant use of another exhortation might not be made discretional? I refer to the first and longer part of the one preceding the General Confession in the Communion Office. "Dearly beloved in the Lord, &c," to "Ye who do truly, &c." In the Prayer Book of 1549, before the Exhortation stands this Rubric.†

"After the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon, or Homily, or some portion of one of the Homilies, as they shall be hereafter divided: wherein if the peo-

* Trans. Sar. Psalt. pp. 119, 386.

† Lit. Ed. vi. p. 79, Parker Ed.

ple be not exhorted to the worthy receiving of the holy Sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, then shall the Curate give this Exhortation, to those that be minded to receive the same." "Dearly beloved in the Lord, &c."

Now would not a restoration of this rule, or some similar provision, be advantageous in ridding us of that redundancy of Exhortations which so singularly characterize the English Offices, and serve not a little to check the fervour of our public worship, especially in the more Festive Seasons? And permit me further to ask,—when this exhortation is used would it not be better to say it at the conclusion of the sermon, &c., as suggested by the Committee of the Upper House of the English Convocation, in the following language?

"Concerning this Exhortation, it was suggested to us, that being read, as it now is, after the withdrawal of all save those who have resolved at that time to communicate, and who must be supposed to have already examined themselves, and after such examination to be now drawing near to eat of that bread and to drink of that cup, the strong expressions it contains as to the danger of an unworthy receiving are unseasonable, and are found in practice to disturb the minds of some of those who remain to communicate. These objections would, in our judgment, be in a great degree removed if this address were read, as the Exhortations which precede it are ordered to be read, at the conclusion of the sermon to the whole congregation, rather than after the Prayer for the

Church Militant. Having regard to the place of this Exhortation after the two which immediately precede it, and which are distinctly ordered to be read at the close of the sermon, and to its tenour as applicable to the whole congregation, consisting of those who have, or have not, yet resolved to remain and communicate, rather than to those who have already begun to take part in the Communion Office, there does not appear to be so distinct a settlement of the place in the service at which this Exhortation must be read as to prove that it may not be read immediately after the sermon, and before, instead of after, the Prayer for the Church Militant, when the Holy Communion is administered."

A more important matter, however, than single Exhortations, is some general provision for both shorter and longer Offices. The former is a desideratum very often for Week-day services, and for shortening the Sunday service without omitting any Office, when the Litany or Communion Office, or both, are conjoined with the Morning or Evening Prayer; and the latter for seasons of unusual solemnity (as Holy Week and High Festivals), when it would be agreeable to many to prolong materially their devotions, appropriating a considerable portion of the day to exercises of worship in the house of prayer. This would tend, I think, to render our services less perfunctory, and more earnest, and could be easily attained by appointing for such more solemn seasons continuous series of Psalms, Lessons, and Homilies or Meditations, with respon-

sary Canticles, Hymns, &c., leaving it to the discretion of the minister to use one or more according to circumstances. In this way could be secured all the substantial advantages of social meetings for *devotion alone*, so much in favour with our Non-Episcopal brethren, without their irregularities, and other disadvantages. Indeed all necessary variety as to length, could be obtained for the service on any day of the year, without disturbing, in the least, the present *order* of our Offices, by appointing portions of Scripture in two or more parts for the Lessons, and by providing Selections of Psalms varying in length, leaving it to the discretion of the minister to read a part or the whole of the portions appointed for the Lessons, and to use the Psalter for the day or a long or short Selection.

For entrusting to the minister such a discretionary power, abundant precedents may be found in both primitive and later times. "The memorials of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets were read *as long as the time permitted*," says Justin Martyr.* "Then let the same clerk who pronounces the Benediction (*i. e.* before the Lesson), *when enough at his discretion has been read*, say, But thou, O Lord, &c." says the Rubric in the Use of Sarum,† respecting the Lesson which follows the Psalmody in the Second Nocturn of the Matin Office, answering to our First Lesson at Morning Prayer. Indeed the construction

* Apology, 1. † Trans. Sar. Psalt. p. 48.

of all the old Matutinal Offices, consisting as they do, sometimes of 3 Nocturns, comprising 18 Psalms, and 9 Lessons, and sometimes of 1 Nocturn, comprising 12 Psalms and 3 Lessons, and sometimes of other numbers of both Psalms and Lessons, affords an abundant exhibition and illustration of this principle.

But I fear I am trespassing too much upon your time, and will hasten to the statement of the few thoughts I have to offer under the second head; viz.—

The fuller adaptation of our Offices to the Festivals and Fasts, and their closer general sympathy with the changes of the Ritual Year.

And here allow me to remark, lest what I have to say should be thought to indicate, in any degree, a want of appreciation of "the Prayer Book as it is," that a study in detail of the Liturgical and Ritual Offices of the Western Church, and to some extent of the Eastern, has led me to admire more and more the wisdom, judgment, and moderation with which ours were compacted out of the old originals, and to wish that they may remain essentially the same, a monument of honour to those who compiled them, and an enduring treasure to us who inherit them. But this implies by no means, I think, that we must content ourselves to use just these Offices and nothing else, on every occasion for which they can possibly be made to answer, any more than a due veneration for the Lord's Prayer implies that we use besides this no other prayers. If it be enough, as we all say, that we frame our prayers

"after this manner," so they do not set aside the use, at times, of this particular form, is it not enough that we model other Offices, when we feel the need of them, after the pattern of our acknowledged standard, so the new is not allowed to supersede the old? Surely, the most *extravagant* veneration for the Reformers cannot require a more exclusive adherence to the forms of worship they delivered unto us than the WHOLE CHURCH has practised with respect to the form of Prayer dictated by our Lord Himself. Retaining, then, our present Offices, just as they are, for the Sundays and Festivals of the half-year from Trinity to Advent, for which nothing better could be devised, I would suggest that *upon* THEIR BASIS *and after their* FORM, special offices like, for instance, our Office for Thanksgiving Day, might be provided for the remaining half-year, to be placed at the end of the Prayer Book, as are the proper Psalms for certain days, and likewise the Proper Lessons, in some editions, and to be designated by some such term as THE PROPER OF THE TIME. This would give us all that is desirable in the way of light and shade, leave untouched in its integrity, what we now have, and provide us fully with what we confessedly need. It would be the introduction of no new, deranging principle, but only the carrying out a little more fully that on which our Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, Proper Psalms and Proper Lessons, have been already provided, and is substantially the same as the Resolution of the English Convocation recommended touching this matter, as the

following extract from the Report of their Proceedings will show:—

"Resolved, That we consider that in any alteration of services, it should be a fundamental principle that the Book of Common Prayer should be maintained entire and unaltered, except so far as shall concern *the Rubrics*, and *the division of Services*, and *the formation of new services* by the recombination of those now existing, with such alterations in the Psalter and Table of Lessons, as may be judged fit."

The italics are my own.

The English Church has, to a considerable extent, acted upon this principle ever since the Reformation. In the Second Book of Edward VI., there is a long table of Proper Psalms and Lessons for divers Feasts and Fasts at Morning and Evening Prayer.* And the Parker Society's collection of Liturgical Offices set forth in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, contains over 200 pages, at the end of the volume, of just such Offices, many of them, as I would suggest to be contained in the Proper of the Time. And in the present English Prayer Book the Offices for the Anniversaries of the Gun Powder Treason, King Charles the Martyr, the Restitution of the Royal Family, and the Eighth of March, as well as the Office for Thanksgiving Day in our Prayer Book, already referred to, are further examples of the same thing.

Such a Proper of the Time could easily be made to

* Lit. Ed. VI. p. 203, Parker Edit.

provide fully for the half-year of Festivals and Fasts. And to mark the difference between Sunday and Festal, and the ordinary Week-day Offices, during the half-year from Trinity to Advent, a very simple and correct rule would be, so far as the Morning Prayer is concerned, to provide another Responsary Anthem to the first Lesson for Week-days, leaving the Te Deum to Sundays and Festivals. And it occurs to me to suggest for this purpose, what stands next to the Te Deum in the old Offices, the Responsary to the viii. Lesson in the Sunday Matins, from Trinity to Advent; the Te Deum being the Responsary to the ix. Lesson during this season. It is as follows, and contains, as will be seen, the germ of the Te Deum:—

Response VIII. *The two Seraphims cried one to the other, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts; all the earth is full of His glory.*

There are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One.

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts, all the earth is full of His Glory.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

All the earth is full of His Glory.

The same substantially could be had if desired in another form, as follows:—

Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts.

The whole earth is full of His Glory.—*Isa.* vi. 3.

But as this would be too short unless sung as an

Anthem, an alternate could be had, better for reading, in the amplification of the same in the Apocalypse:—

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.

Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.

Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.

Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Amen.

Still another mode, and a more comprehensive one, of providing for this case would be, to give in the Proper of the Time the whole group of Lauds Psalms and Canticles which follow in order after the First Lesson and its Responsary, and from which the Benedicite and Jubilate in our Morning Prayer are transferred, as may be seen in the foregoing synopsis. This, by leaving it to the discretion of the Minister to use either a Psalm or Canticle, or the whole group, on the day for which it is appointed, would give every needed variety of Responsary Canticles to the First Lesson when the Te Deum was not used, and provide a full, grand Morning Office, especially suited for Festal Seasons, and compensate for the omission of the Litany (the 51st Psalm being one) which, by being restricted to Penitential Seasons, according to its original use, would much better mark them, as

would the Te Deum the Sundays and Festivals. To save all trouble of reference, I will give this whole group. See Appendix, B.

In support of this suggestion, I beg leave to quote a short passage from a very able and comprehensive work on the Ritual of the English Church.*

"Nor can I forbear to remark, that if any revision of our Morning Office were undertaken, on the principle of enriching it, with the least possible amount of disturbance, or increase of complexity, from the older forms, the Office which we have just reviewed (*i. e.* Lauds) would suggest one effective method of accomplishing this object. The weak points of our present Office, so to speak—those in which it fails to render with as much *fulness* as could be desired, the mind of the older forms—are, 1. The small amount, quantitatively, of psalmody: and, 2. The absence of any expression by means of *selected Psalms* of Lauds or Prime ideas. The expression of these is thrown upon other features, as Canticles (or Psalms used as Canticles), Collects, Petitions, &c. Now by introducing immediately after the Te Deum or Benedicite, a small group of Lauds and Prime Psalms, exactly as is done in the private office before us [the Primer of 1568], this defect would be in a measure remedied. *Two* unvarying Lauds Psalms, as *e. g.* the 63d and 148th, both of universal use in East and West, might suffice; with *one* of the Prime Psalms (118th, on the resurrec-

* Freeman's Principles of Divine Service. Masters, Lond.

tion) for Sundays, and one (the practical 101st, or part of 119th) for week days. A single and fixed Antiphon, as here, or varying only for the Sunday or other Festival, might be added. This group of Psalms then, following the Te Deum or Benedicite (itself a Lauds feature), would precede the Second Lesson; and thus the ancient alternation of Psalmody and Lessons be in a very simple manner restored."*

May I be allowed, in this connexion, to remark upon what would be the general features of the Proper of the Time, if respect should be had in providing it to ancient precedent? In general terms it would be of course, as already hinted, the development into a predominant influence of the penitential element of our present Offices for the Penitential Seasons, and a similar development of the jubilant or laudatory element for the Festal Seasons. This would imply the omission of some parts of our Offices as now used, sometimes, and additions to the same at other times. To be specific—it would require other introductory Sentences, or a discretion as to the use or omission of the Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution—a more penitential introduction for Lent, the Confession being more at length, like the Prayer of Manasses, for instance—the omission at times of the jubilant Invitatory, Venite, exultemus, and prefacing it, as the beginning of the Psalmody for the Day, at other times with a *more* jubilant anthem, or else the sub-

* P. 299.

stitution of another in its place—enlarging considerably the table of Proper Psalms, and revising a good deal the table of Proper Lessons—omitting for some seasons the Te Deum altogether, and then for other seasons the Litany altogether—combining with the Litany the Penitential Psalms, and both or either with the Morning or Evening Prayer—restoring to the Communion Office its ancient Proper Psalms, to mark in that Office also the ever recurring changes of the seasons, and to render it more complete when used as a separate service—providing for incorporating the Litany with this service, and the omission of some portions of it under specified circumstances—providing anew for the *musical* rendering of some parts of this Office which have been sung, except by our American Church, from the beginning of their use, and some other lesser matters which will be indicated a little further on.

And now to gather up into one connected view all the changes which the foregoing suggestions imply, and to show how closely the Proper of the Time, as above proposed, would adhere to our present order of worship, allow me on the basis of our Rubrics, as now existing, to indicate by additions and alterations, in italics, where such changes would occur, and what they would be. Premising, however, that the italics show *all* the changes for both Festal and Penitential Seasons, not more than *half* of which could therefore occur at any one time. And to save you the trouble of making the references to which I would invite your

attention, under each particular, I will write out as notes such passages from the authors referred to, as are most essential to a fair, if not a *full*, exhibition of this important and interesting subject.

"The minister shall begin the MORNING PRAYER by reading one or more of the following sentences of Scripture;" *or, at his discretion omitting all that follows to the Lord's Prayer, may begin with Our Father, &c.; provided that the Confession and Absolution be used at least once on the Lord's day, either in the Morning Prayer, or Office for the Holy Communion.**

SENTENCES OF SCRIPTURE.

Then the Minister shall say,

Let us humbly confess our sins unto Almighty God.†

Or else,

"Dearly beloved brethren," &c., as now.

All following as now to the end of

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

"Then likewise he shall say," *except on the three days preceding Easter,*‡

"O, Lord," &c., to "The Lord's Name be praised."

* "The priest being in the choir shall begin with a loud voice the Lord's Prayer."—*Rub. at the beginning of Morning Prayer, Prayer Book of* 1549.

† See remarks on this, above, p. 353.

‡ "But in the three days preceding Easter, at all the Hours, nothing of the above is said, except Our Father."—*Rub. at the end of these Versicles, Tr. Sarum. Psalt.* p. 26.

"Then shall be said or sung the following Anthem, except on those days for which," &c., to "nineteenth day of the month;" *and except on the three days next preceding Easter.**

"Then shall follow a portion of the Psalms," &c.

Gloria in Excelsis.

"Then shall be read the First Lesson according to the Table or Calendar."

"After which shall be said or sung the following Hymn *on all Sundays and Festivals, except in Lent and Advent, when, as likewise on all Week-days not Festivals, instead of Te Deum may be said or sung the Response appointed in the Proper of the Time; or if none be appointed, one, or all of the Psalms, or Canticles of Praise, on the day for which the same may be provided, which are also to be found in the Proper of the Time. But Te Deum is used daily from Easter to Ascension Day, inclusive, except on Monday in Rogation.*†

* The general *rule.* See Rubrics of *all* the most important Rituals *in loco,* in which the direction is "not to say the Venite," but to pass on from the Lord's Prayer to the Psalms for the Day. With our penitential introduction, which the old offices had not, such a usage would be very solemn, and most appropriately mark the three most solemn days of the year.

† "Te Deum is said (except as after mentioned) on all Sundays and Feasts of ix. Lessons, and also in certain Feasts of iii. Lessons following The Four Times which are without the week of Pentecost. * * * It should not be said throughout Advent, whatever be the service; but let the Ninth Responsary

"Note. That before every Lesson," &c., to the end as now.

TE DEUM LAUDAMUS.

Or this Canticle.

BENEDICITE.

"Then shall be read in like manner the Second Lesson," &c.

SECOND LESSON.

"And after that the following Psalm," *or its substitute, when provided in the Proper of the Time.*

JUBILATE DEO.

Or this Hymn.

BENEDICTUS.

"Then shall be said," &c.

APOSTLE'S CREED.

be repeated (which is to be done, however, only on Sundays and Feasts of ix. Lessons). It should not be said, moreover, in Vigils, nor in The Four Times, except in the Vigil of the Epiphany when it happens on a Sunday, and except in The Four Times of the week of Pentecost, when it is said. Nor should it be said from the Sunday in Septuagesima, inclusive, to Easter Day; nor on Week-days, when it is the Week-day Service."—*Rubric prefacing Te Deum, Tr. Sar. Psalt.* 53.

As appears from a phrase of the foregoing, the English Use substituted the Te Deum for the *repetition* of the Ninth Response, while the Roman substituted it for the Response itself. The Benedictine Use had twelve lessons on Sundays and great Festivals, with the Te Deum as the *invariable* response.

Or this.

NICENE CREED.

"And after that," &c.

"The Lord be with you.
Ans. And with thy Spirit.
Minister. Let us pray."

*Here, on Week-days not Festivals, at the discretion of the Minister, may be said the Petitions to be found in the Proper of the Time,** [See Appendix A.] *or, instead of them, the Lesser Litany.*

Or else,

"O Lord, show thy mercy," &c., as now.

"Then shall follow the Collect for the day," &c., as now.

A COLLECT FOR PEACE.

A COLLECT FOR GRACE.

A PRAYER FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, &c.

Here may follow an Anthem,† or Hymn, or the

* See Rubric from Sar. Psalt. in a note above, p. 342. Another old authority says: "In Feriis Adv. Quadr. Quatuor Temp. et Vigiliarum, quæ jejunantur (excepta Vigilia Nativit. Domini, et Vigilia, ac Quatuor Temporibus Pent.) post Antiphonam ad Benedictus, et in Vesperis ad Magnificat, dicuntur sequentes Preces flexis genibus: aliis temporibus non dicuntur."—*Rubric at the end of Lauds.*

† "In Quires and Places where they sing, here followeth the Anthem."—*Rubric in the present English Prayer Book.*

It is worthy of remark that although the revisers of the

Litany, or the Office for the Holy Communion, if they are to be used; otherwise the Prayers following to the end of Morning [*or Evening*] *Prayer.*

A PRAYER FOR THE CLERGY AND PEOPLE.

And all as now to

"Here endeth the Order of Morning Prayer."

THE ORDER FOR DAILY EVENING PRAYER.

Upon this it is unnecessary to remark, as my aim is simply to illustrate a principle, applying to both Offices alike.

English Offices in 1549 "cut off" all "Anthems," and the Prayer Book underwent three revisions after that, without any provision being made for their restoration, yet so much had the lack of them been felt, that at the last revision the foregoing Rubric was inserted after the Collect for Grace in the Morning Prayer, and the Collect for Aid against Perils in the Evening Prayer. The effect would hardly be good, I think, to rise here in the midst of Prayers for the purpose of singing an Anthem: the transition would be altogether too abrupt. What is contemplated is, that when the transition to the Litany is not here made as now, that is, if the Litany be not said, and the Holy Communion is to be celebrated, the Morning Prayer may end here, and an Anthem, or Introit Psalm for the Day, or Psalm in metre as now, may be sung before the Ante-Communion begins; the Prayer for the Clergy and People, and that for all Conditions of Men, being more than compensated for in the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church Militant, and the General Thanksgiving in the Eucharistic Office. The idea is, simply to cut off redundancy, and shorten the service, when the Holy Communion follows the Morning Prayer, with or without the Litany.

THE LITANY, OR GENERAL SUPPLICATION.

To be used in connexion with Morning or Evening Prayer, or the Office for the Holy Communion, or as a separate Office, with or without Psalms, Lessons, Anthems, or Hymns, and other Prayers, as the Minister in his discretion may think fit. Provided, that it SHALL *be used daily on the week-days of Lent, on all Wednesdays and Fridays of the year, except Christmas Day, on Ember and Rogation Days, and on all other solemn days of Fasting and Humiliation.**

"O God, the Father of Heaven," &c.
And all as now to the end of the Prayer,
"We humbly beseech Thee, O Father," &c.

Here may follow any Special Prayers or Thanksgivings,† or, when the Communion Service is to follow,

* See Rubric from the Sarum Psalter, above given in a note, p. 343, touching the original design and use of the Litany. And besides, the following from the long Rubric preceding the Penitential Psalms:

"The Penitential Psalms, with the Antiphon "Remember not, Lord, our offences," &c. [as in our Litany], followed by Petitions, Collects, and the Litany (as in the first Monday in Quadragesima), were among the Offices of Monday in Rogations, at the end of the Procession after None, and before the Office for the Holy Communion, when all was to be said without note." [*i. e.* not sung].—*Trans. Sar. Psalt.* p. 402.

† "At Morning Prayer, the Litany being ended, shall be said the following Prayers, immediately before the General Thanksgiving."—*Rubric in our Office for Ash-Wednesday.*

In the English Litany of 1604, after the Prayer, "We hum

the Minister may, at his discretion, omit the General Thanksgiving and Prayer of St. Chrysostom, ending with, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c., or pass on to the Collect for Purity in the Office for the Holy Communion.

"Here endeth the Litany."

THE ORDER FOR THE HOLY COMMUNION.

"If among those," &c., as now, to the end.

"The same order," &c., as now, to the end.

"The Table at the Communion-time," &c., as now, to the end.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

THE COLLECT.

bly beseech Thee," &c., is printed at length a Prayer for the King, one for the Royal Family, one for the Clergy and People, and then the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, and "The grace," &c. This suggests the propriety of introducing the Prayer for the President, and the one following it for the Clergy and People, when the Litany is used as a distinct service; or indeed, should it be desired, of introducing the whole group of Morning and Evening Prayers, from the Collect for the Day, any occasional Prayers or Thanksgivings which may be appropriate, or desired, coming in, as now, before the General Thanksgiving.

In the old Sarum Litany there are twelve Collects following a Prayer somewhat similar to "We humbly beseech Thee," &c., being, in their order after this first, ours for the Fourth Sunday after Trinity, the first in our Communion Office, the one for Clergy and People in our Morning and Evening Prayer, and that for Peace in our Evening Prayer, and so on—those of the York and Hereford Uses differing somewhat from the Use of Sarum.

Then shall be said or sung the Psalm appointed for the Introit, according to the Table of Introits* [see

* When the Holy Communion is made a distinct service, it is desirable and *necessary* in order to its completeness, that a portion of the Psalter should be incorporated with it. Nor only this, it is a defect of our Office, though so unexceptionable and admirable generally, that it is without its proper Initial Psalm. For many centuries before the second revision of the English Liturgy, the proper Psalm for the Day had been as much a matter of course as the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel; and indeed, in the First Book of Edward the Sixth, it was printed along with them. But for a *much longer* period this feature had characterized the Oriental Liturgies, as it originated very early in the East (how early is not known), and was *last of all* adopted by the Church of Rome.[1] In Wheatly's Commentary on the Common Prayer, he thus speaks of this matter:

"In the first Common Prayer Book of King Edward VI., before every Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, there is a Psalm printed, which contains something prophetical of Evangelical history used upon each Sunday and holy-day, or is some way or other proper to the day; * * * * But in the second edition of King Edward's book it was laid aside; though the reason they had for doing so is not easily assigned. For it is very certain that the use of Introits to begin the Communion Office was not only unexceptionable, but of great antiquity in the Church: Durand proving that they were taken into Divine service before the time of St. Jerom. And it is plain they would still have been very useful, since the want of them is forced to be sup-

(1) If, as tradition asserts, the Provincial Roman Church did not commence its Liturgy with a hymn till the time of S. Celestine I., it would appear to have been the last to adopt the custom. The Mozarabic Office was so commenced at least as early as the time of S. Damasus, and it would seem that the Eastern Liturgies had done so long before.—*Neale's Hist. East. Church*, vol. i. 363.

Appendix C], *with the Gloria Patri. Then may*

plied by the singing of Anthems in Cathedrals, and part of a Psalm in metre in parish churches. And therefore I cannot but think it would have been much more decent for us to have been guided by the Church what Psalms to have used in that intermediate time, than to stand to the direction of every illiterate parish clerk, who too often has neither judgment to choose a Psalm proper to the occasion, nor skill to sing it so as to assist devotion."—*Page* 175, *Oxford Ed.*

While thus approving the use of the Introit, and regretting its discontinuance, he complains of not knowing how to reconcile the two Rubrics in King Edward's Book prescribing its use, as one would seem to indicate that it was to be sung *before* the Collect for Purity, and the other *after*. He says:

"The Introits also I have already spoke to in page 175. Though I do not know how to reconcile this order for singing it before the Minister begins the Office with another Rubric which stands in the same book immediately after the prayer, *Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open*, &c., which orders *that the Priest then shall say a Psalm appointed for the Introit.*" —*Page* 226, *Note.*

Every one must be equally puzzled, if he does not go beyond the Liturgy of Edward VI. Not knowing how to understand this matter, I have given some little time to its investigation, and beg leave to state the conclusion to which I have come. To make it clear, I will transcribe the introductory portion of the Old English Liturgy, giving by the side of it the corresponding parts of the Liturgy of Edward the VI. See Appendix D.

From this it appears that there were two Psalms sung at the beginning of the Old English Liturgy, the first of which, "*Judica me Deus,*" preceded and followed by its Antiphon "*Introibo,*" &c., was fixed and invariable, and the second, called the *office* "officium," which varied with the day, as did the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, with which it was printed, as in

follow either the Greater or Lesser Litany, if the same

the first Book of Edward VI. Now that the "*officium*" is referred to, and not the fixed Psalm "*Judica me Deus,*" is manifest, in the first place from the fact that the first Rubric in Edward's book calls it a Psalm "*for the office,*" and in the second from the fact that no fixed Psalm is given in this book, but only the "*officium*" (as the English Use called it), varying like, and printed with, the Epistles and Gospels. But suppose it refers to the fixed Psalm (against which I have placed the Rubric in Edward's book, for the sake of illustration, though it properly belongs only to the second place where it stands, opposite to "*officium*"), it is sung *after* the Collect for Purity, for *neither the fixed Psalm, nor the variable "officium," comes before this Collect.* It is manifest, therefore, from comparing Edward's Book with the old Liturgy, of which it was a revision, that the proper place for the "*office*" or Introit Psalm, as of the *fixed Psalm* likewise if there were one, is *after* the Collect, for Purity, and not before it. We must therefore consider the first Rubric in Edward's Liturgy a general *anticipatory* direction, definitely specified in the second, and deriving its ambiguity from its not specifying the intervention of the Collect, which it was unnecessary then to do, it being understood *as a matter of course* from long established usage, as it manifestly must have been from the unequivocal directions of the old Rubrics. Though this is undoubtedly the true solution of the difficulty, I cannot forbear remarking that it would be more analogous to the Eastern Liturgy to sing the Introit immediately at the end of the Litany, when the Collect for Purity would serve as the "Prayer of the Antiphon."

See Appendix E.

Should we end the Litany, however, when the Communion is to follow, at the prayer "We humbly beseech Thee, O Father," with the utmost propriety the Collect for Purity could be taken before rising for the Introit, for this Collect, while it occupied

*hath not been used in the service immediately preceding.**

Then shall the Minister, turning to the People, rehearse distinctly the TEN COMMANDMENTS; and the

the same place in the old Sarum Liturgy that it does in ours, was the third one in order, of the twelve at the end of the Litany, in the Sarum Use, above mentioned. And moreover the *Psalm* has been generally accounted *the beginning of the Liturgy*, and all that precedes this preparatory to it.[1]

* By Lesser Litany is meant the portion of ours usually omitted. As to authority for the introduction of the Litany in this place, I would refer to the old amplification of the Kyrie mentioned in Appendix D., and give the following paragraph from Mr. Palmer:

"At Milan, in Germany, and probably Ireland, we find an Anthem sung at the beginning [of the Communion Office.] This was followed by the form of *Kyrie Eleëson*, derived from the Eastern Church, and a long Litany, in which the Deacon directed the people to pray for many different objects, and the people responded. This form was manifestly taken from the ancient practice of the Eastern Church also. After the Litany was concluded, the hymn "*Gloria in Excelsis*" was sung, and the Collect read. At Rome the same rite prevailed, except that the *Gloria in Excelsis* was not sung when the Litany was said. In the patriarchate of Constantinople, the introduction to the Lessons, [*i.e.* Epistle and Gospel,] contained a Litany (which was probably the original of the Western Litanies just alluded to), three Anthems, and the celebrated hymn *Trisagios.*"—*Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. ii. p. 21.

---

[1] "It seems certain, that the Liturgical office, in the Eastern Church of the third century, commenced with a Psalm or Hymn. Whatever precedes this, is to be regarded rather in the light of a preparation to the office, than as the office itself." —*Neale's Hist. East. Church*, vol. i. 359.

People, still kneeling, shall, after every commandment, ask God mercy for their transgressions for the time past, and grace to keep the law for the time to come." *But the Minister may, at his discretion, omit all that follows to the Collect for the Day,* if a Lesson from the Old Testament hath been read in the service immediately preceding;* PROVIDED, *that the Decalogue shall be rehearsed in the hearing of the people at least once in every month.*†

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

And all as now to

"Then shall be said the Collect of the Day. *And after that, if it hath not been said in the service immediately preceding, the Prayer for the President of the United States,‡ and any other Collects or Prayers, if occasion requires.*§ And immediately after, the Minister," &c., as now to the end.

Then shall be *said or sung on Sundays and Festivals, the* NICENE CREED, *unless it hath been used in*

* See old English Offices, and that of Ed. VI., Appendix D.

† Analogous to the discretional use of the Gospel, &c., in our Baptismal Office for Infants.

‡ See English Prayer Book, in which the Prayer for the Sovereign comes here.

§ "*Deinde dicitur oratio, sic determinando.* * * *Et si aliqua memoria habenda est, iterum dicat sacerdos,* Oremus, *ut supra. Et quando sunt plures collectæ dicendæ: tunc omnes orationes quæ sequuntur sub uno* Per Dominum *et uno* Oremus *dicantur.*" —*Rubric in loco, Sarum Liturgy.*

*the service immediately preceding.** *On Week-days not Feasts, the Creed may be omitted.*†

"Then the Minister shall declare," &c., as now. *Then shall be sung a Hymn or Anthem.*

Then shall follow the Sermon; *which being ended, if the Holy Communion is to be administered, and the*

* This contemplates making the Nicene Creed *always* the *Communion Creed*, as it has ever been in the Church, and *as the present times especially require*. As to the phrase said or *sung*, I would simply remark, that although the Rubric of the Prayer Book of 1549, which prescribed it to be sung, was altered in the revision of 1552 to "said," and so continued on through the revisions of 1559 and 1604, yet at the last revision in 1662, it was changed to read thus: "And the Gospel ended, shall be sung or said the Creed following," &c. Though the Apostle's Creed has *never* been sung as an Anthem in the Church, the Nicene Creed has *always* been, just as much as the Te Deum; than which it is scarcely less a Doxology, or more a Confession of Faith. And in England, during the whole period just mentioned, though the Rubric said "*said*," it was habitually *sung*. Scarcely an English service can be met with which has not the Nicene Creed with its proper music, the same precisely as the Te Deum. The reason however for this suggestion here is, to make the Creed compensate measurably for the loss of the Te Deum when Morning Prayer does not precede the Holy Communion.

† See Rubric before quoted from the 1 Book of Ed. VI. p. 352, above.

Also: "Hæc sunt festa quibus dicendum est *Credo* secundum usum Sarum. Omnibus dominicis diebus per totum annum, ad magnam missam sive de dominica agitur, sive non." * *

"Dicetur etiam per octo dies nativitatis Domini, paschæ, et penthecostes; et in omni duplici festo per annum: et in omnibus festis apostolorum et evangelistarum."—*From Rubric in loco, Sar. Lit.*

people have not in the sermon been exhorted to the worthily receiving of the Holy Sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, the Minister shall then say the Exhortation—"Dearly beloved in the Lord," &c., as far as to the word "Amen." Then shall follow the Offertory,† if the offerings of the*

* See Rubric quoted from the 1 Book of Edward VI., p. 352, above, when speaking of Exhortations.

† "(*Offertorium.*) The verse so called, which was sung just before the oblation of the elements by the Priest. And it was at this time that anciently the people made their offerings. A custom which is even now observed upon certain occasions in some Churches abroad, though fallen into otherwise total disuse in the Roman Communion. * * * An old *Ordo Romanus* cited by *Bona*, lib. 2, cap. ix. § 1, thus describes the manner of offering. "Cantores cantant offertorium cum versibus, et populus dat oblationes suas, id est panem et vinum, et offerunt cum Fanonibus candidis, primo masculi, deinde fœminæ. * * * The *offertorium cum versibus* relates to a period when the custom of the people really offering was not neglected: and then not only verses, but even whole Psalms were added to the *Offertory Proper;* and sometimes, for the collecting took much time, these were sung and repeated again and again."—*Maskell*, pp. 53, 55.

In the Prayer Book of 1549, before the Offertory Sentences, stands this Rubric:

"Then shall follow for the Offertory one or more of these Sentences of Holy Scripture, to be sung whiles the people do offer, or else one of them to be said by the Minister immediately afore the offering."

And after them as follows:

"Where there be Clerks, they shall sing one, or many of the sentences above written, according to the length and shortness of time that the people be offering."

people are to be collected, and after this the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church Militant, when, if there be no Communion, the Minister may, at his discretion, use any other prayers set forth by this Church, and let the people depart with the blessing.

Whilst these sentences are in reading, the Deacons, Churchwardens, &c.," as now, "and bring it to the Priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the Holy Table."*

"And the Priest shall then," &c., as now.

PRAYER FOR THE CHURCH MILITANT.

EXHORTATION.

CONFESSION.

ABSOLUTION.

SENTENCES OF SCRIPTURE.

Lift up your hearts, &c.

"It is very meet, right," &c.

* In an old Scotch Communion Office which lies before me, the Rubric at this place ends thus: "Who shall present it," &c., "and set it upon the holy table, saying:"

"Blessed be thou, O Lord God, for ever and ever; thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine: thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all: both riches and honour come of thee, and of thine own do we give unto thee. Amen."

Would not some such sentence of oblation, said or sung as the alms are put upon the holy table, contribute very materially to the solemnity of this act, and impress the people with the sacred obligation of the sadly neglected duty of almsgiving?

"Here shall follow the Proper Preface," &c., "or else" *the priest shall say*,—

"Therefore, with Angels," &c., "evermore praising Thee, and saying,"*

* I have spaced off by paragraph the Seraphic Hymn which *only* is the chorus, or people's part, the "Therefore with Angels" being the conclusion of the Prefaces, and therefore the *Priest's* part. In the English Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1559, the latter was properly paragraphed, from which the editions of 1604 and 1662 may be seen to differ, though in doing so, they differ from all the important Liturgies of Christendom, except that of Nestorius, as given by Brett, and even from that as given by Neale, as the following extracts, which are copied verbatim, will show:

S. CHRYSOSTOM.

"shouting, and saying, the triumphal hymn.
Choir. Holy, Holy, Holy," &c.

ARMENIAN.

"to cry, to call, and say,
Choir. Holy, Holy, Holy," &c.

S. JAMES.

"praising, vociferating, and saying,
Choir. Holy, Holy, Holy," &c.

S. BASIL.

"shouting, and saying, the triumphal hymn,
Choir. Holy, Holy, Holy," &c.

S. MARK.

"who with them laud Thee and say,
People. Holy, Holy, Holy," &c.

COPTIC, S. BASIL.

"perpetually proclaiming the hymn of glory,
People. Holy, Holy, Holy," &c.

People.—"Holy, Holy, Holy," &c.
All as now, to the end of the

PRAYER OF CONSECRATION.

"Here may be sung a Hymn, or part of a Hymn, from the Selection for the Feasts and Fasts," *and likewise, during the administration, may be sung by the Choir appropriate Communion Anthems.**

MOZARABIC.

"Whom Angels and Archangels extol, thus saying,
Holy, Holy, Holy," &c.

THEODORE, THE INTERPRETER (NESTORIAN).

"crying one to the other, saying and answering,
Priest aloud. Holy, Holy, Holy," &c.

* At this place in the Prayer Book of 1549, stands the following Rubric:

"*In the Communion time the Clerks shall sing,*

ii. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world: have mercy upon us.

ii. O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world: grant us thy peace.

Beginning so soon as the Priest doth receive the Communion."

Mr. Jebb says, "It was the primitive usage to sing a Psalm, the 34th, during the administration. Some resemblance to this custom is still preserved at Durham Cathedral, where a soft symphony is then played on the organ."

Explaining ("Communionem"), Mr. Maskell says: "It was an Antiphon, or verse taken from a Psalm, which varied with the day; and was sung whilst the people communicated. See *Gerbert*, tom. i. p. 458. S. Augustine speaks of it, in his own time at Carthage: "Ut hymni ad altare dicerentur de Psalmorum libro, sive ante oblationem, sive cum distribueretur populo quod fuisset oblatum."—*Retract.* lib. ii. cap. xi."

It is the well known custom of most of our Non-Episcopal

"Then shall the Priest first receive," &c., and all as now to

The Lord's Prayer.

Thanksgiving.

"Then shall be said or sung, all standing, the Gloria in Excelsis," *except at those times when the Te Deum is not said in the Morning Prayer, when the Gloria in Excelsis is not to be sung;* but some proper Hymn, or Post Communion Anthem, may be sung in its stead.*†

"Then the Priest (the Bishop if he be present)," &c.

Benediction.

I have not thought it necessary in this summing up of the preceding discussion, on the basis of the present Rubrics of the Prayer Book, to write them all out in full, but merely to indicate where the altera-

brethren to sing verses of Hymns during the administration of the Communion; and, as appears from the foregoing, it is an old Catholic custom, sanctioned likewise by the Reformed Church of England. And as the want of something of the sort is generally felt among us before and after we have made our own Communion, to engage our thoughts and assist devotion, I have quoted the authorities given on this point.

* "Gloria in excelsis dicitur quandocunque in Matutino dictus est Hymnus *Te Deum* præterquam in Missa feriæ quintæ in cæna Domini, et Sabbati sancti, in quibus *Gloria in Excelsis* dicitur, quamvis in officio non sit dictum *Te Deum*."—*Rubr. in loco.*

† See Communion Office of 1549, where a large number of very appropriate ones are given.

tions or additions would come, by giving a few words of the paragraphs preceding and following them; so that with a Prayer Book in hand you can perceive at a glance where they would occur, and how entirely undisturbed they would leave its present contents. But it would not be necessary, were this principle acted upon, to disturb even the *Rubrics*, at present. In the Proper of the Time the rubrical alterations, as well as all others, could be given. And were such Proper of the Time, embracing *all* permitted changes, to be *appended* to the Prayer Book *as a supplement*, it being left for a time to the discretion of Ministers and Congregations to avail themselves of its provisions, or not, in a few years a USE would come to be established, which could then easily, as it would naturally, become the law of the Church. In this way the wishes of a very large portion of our Church could be met, without inflicting the least wrong upon those who desire no changes for themselves, as they would have nothing to which they are at present averse, forced upon them; but could then, as well as now, use "*the Prayer Book as it is.*"

Thus much, it strikes me, *by way of experiment merely*, could be safely and peacefully done; but more than this it would be very hazardous, I fear, to attempt at present. We are too little informed in Ritual matters, most of us, both of the Clergy and Laity, to undertake anything that should be binding on our wide-spread Communion, till it shall have been *tested by use*, and *generally* and *voluntarily* adopted. To

alter the devotional formularies of a people, in which they have been reared up from infancy to manhood, and many to old age, is a very serious business. And without *a general and liberal knowledge of Ritual principles*, which are as broadly defined, and as well established, as are the principles of any department of science or art, *all* meddling in these matters is dangerous to the last degree. And I trust that what I have said upon this subject, will not be considered as in any sense *propositions or suggestions put forth to be acted upon*, as my sole object has been to invite your attention to—prove, and illustrate the important fact, that we need not turn aside from "the old paths" to attain all that we can desire, but, on the contrary, that a closer conformity to those ritual principles which underlie the present Prayer Book Offices, will supply *all* the wants which somewhat of a departure from them has caused to be so deeply felt. *And this, too, without disturbing or endangering, or in any way meddling with, the integrity, or order, of what we now have.*

Begging that you will pardon me for so long detaining you,

I remain, Right Reverend and Dear Sir,

Most respectfully and humbly,

Your Servant in Christ,

J. F. Young.

Sept. 15th, 1856.

APPENDIX A.

Lord, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.
Our Father, &c.

Min. I said, Lord, be merciful unto me.
Ans. Heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee.
Min. Turn thee again, O Lord, at the last.
Ans. And be gracious unto thy servants.
Min. Let thy merciful kindness, O Lord, be upon us.
Ans. Like as we do put our trust in Thee.
Min. Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness.
Ans. And let thy saints sing with joyfulness.
Min. O Lord, save the king.
Ans. And mercifully hear us, when we call upon Thee.
Min. O, save Thy people, and give Thy blessing unto Thine
Ans. Feed them, and set them up for ever. [inheritance.
Min. O, think upon Thy congregation.
Ans. Whom Thou hast purchased and redeemed of old.
Min. Peace be within Thy walls.
Ans. And plenteousness within Thy palaces.
Min. Let us pray for our absent brethren.
Ans. My God, save Thy servants, who put their trust in
[*Min.* For our benefactors. [Thee.
Ans. O God, make all good to abound towards them; and may the increase of their fruits be the increase of their joy.]
Min. For the afflicted and for captives.
Ans. Deliver them, O God of Israel, out of all their
Min. Send Thou help from the sanctuary. [troubles.
Ans. And strengthen them out of Zion.

Min. Lord, hear my prayer.
Ans. And let my cry come unto Thee.

At Lauds.—Psalm 130. Out of the deep, &c. Glory, &c.
At Vespers.—Psalm 51. Have mercy upon me, O God, &c. Glory, &c.

And then

Min. Turn us again, O Lord God of hosts.
Ans. Show the light of Thy countenance, and we shall be whole.
Min. Arise, O Lord! help us.
Ans. And deliver us, for Thy name's sake.
Min. Lord, hear my prayer.
Ans. And let my cry come unto Thee.
Min. The Lord be with you.
Ans. And with thy spirit.
Min. Let us pray.

Then follows the Collect for the Day, &c., as with us.

Answering exactly to this, and coming at the corresponding place in the Greek Offices, is the Great Ectene, as follows:—

Deacon. Let us accomplish our supplications to the Lord.
Choir. Lord, have mercy.
Assist, preserve, pity, and protect us, O God, by Thy Grace.
Choir. Lord, have mercy.
Deacon. That the whole day may be perfect, holy, peaceful, without sin, let us ask from the Lord.
Choir. Grant, O Lord. *And so at the end of every petition.*
[*Or*, That we may pass this whole evening in perfection and holiness.]
Deacon. The Angel of peace, faithful guide, guardian of our souls and bodies, let us, &c.
Pardon and remission of our sins and transgressions, let us, &c.
Things that are good and profitable for our souls, and peace to the world, let us, &c.

That we may accomplish the remainder of our lives in peace and penitence, let us, &c.

Christian ends of our lives, without torment, without shame, peaceful, and a good defence at the fearful tribunal, let us ask from Christ.

Priest. Exclamation. For thou art the good God, and the lover of men, and to Thee is due praise, to Thee is due honour, to Thee is due glory—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—now and ever, and to ages of ages.

Choir. Amen.

Priest. Peace to all.

Choir. And with thy spirit.

Deacon. Let us bow our heads to the Lord.

Choir. To Thee, O Lord.

The Priest saith the Prayer of bowing down the head.

This is similar to our Collect for Peace, at Morning Prayer, and our Collect for Aid against Perils, at Evening Prayer.

APPENDIX B.

LAUDS

OR

PSALMS AND CANTICLES OF PRAISE.

To be used, one or more, on the days for which they are appointed, after the First Lesson at Morning Prayer, when the Hymn Te Deum is not said; or, the whole group for the day after Te Deum, at the discretion of the Minister.

[*Min.* The Lord is high above all nations.

Ans. And his glory above the Heavens.

Min. O God, make speed to save us.

Ans. O Lord, make haste to help us.

Min. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

Ans. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

Min. Praise ye the Lord.

Ans. The Lord's name be praised.]

ON SUNDAYS.

[*Part I.*]

Psalm XCIII.

The Lord is King, and hath put on glorious apparel; the Lord hath put on his apparel, and girded himself with strength.

He hath made the round world so sure, that it cannot be moved.

Ever since the world began, hath thy seat been prepared: thou art from everlasting.

The floods are risen, O Lord, the floods have lift up their voice; the floods lift up their waves.

The waves of the sea are mighty, and rage horribly; but yet the Lord, who dwelleth on high, is mightier.

Thy testimonies, O Lord, are very sure: holiness becometh thine house for ever.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

Psalm LXIII.

O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee.

My soul thirsteth for thee; my flesh also longeth after thee, in a barren and dry land where no water is.

Thus have I looked for thee in holiness, that I might behold thy power and glory.

For thy loving kindness is better than the life itself: my lips shall praise thee.

As long as I live will I magnify thee in this manner, and lift up my hands in thy Name.

My soul shall be satisfied, even as it were with marrow and fatness, when my mouth praiseth thee with joyful lips.

Have I not remembered thee in my bed, and thought upon thee when I was waking?

Because thou hast been my helper; therefore under the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice.

My soul hangeth upon thee; thy right hand hath upholden me.

These also that seek the hurt of my soul, they shall go under the earth.

Let them fall upon the edge of the sword, that they may be a portion for foxes.

But the King shall rejoice in God; all they also that swear by him shall be commended; for the mouth of them that speak lies shall be stopped.

Psalm LXVII.

GOD be merciful unto us, and bless us, and show us the light of his countenance, and be merciful unto us;

That thy way may be known upon earth, thy saving health among all nations.

Let the people praise thee, O God; yea, let all the people praise thee.

O let the nations rejoice and be glad; for thou shalt judge the folk righteously, and govern the nations upon earth.

Let the people praise thee, O God; yea, let all the people praise thee.

Then shall the earth bring forth her increase; and God, even our own God, shall give us his blessing.

God shall bless us; and all the ends of the world shall fear him.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was, &c.

"*Instead of Psalms XCIII. and C., from Septuagesima to Easter, are said Ps. LI.*, Have mercy upon me, *and Ps. CXVIII.*, O give thanks." *Sarum Psalt. p.* 58.

[*Part II.*]

Song of the three Children.

O all ye Works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Angels of the Lord, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Heavens, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Waters that be above the firmament, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O all ye Powers of the Lord, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Sun and Moon, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Stars of Heaven, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Showers and Dew, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Winds of God, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Fire and Heat, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Winter and Summer, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Dews and Frosts, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Frost and Cold, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Ice and Snow, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Nights and Days, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Light and Darkness, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Lightnings and Clouds, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O let the Earth bless the Lord; yea, let it praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Mountains and Hills, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O all ye Green Things upon the earth, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Wells, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Seas and Floods, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Whales, and all that move in the waters, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O all ye Fowls of the Air, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O all ye Beasts and Cattle, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Children of Men, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O let Israel bless the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Priests of the Lord, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Servants of the Lord, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye Spirits and Souls of the Righteous, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

O ye holy and humble Men of heart, bless ye the Lord; praise him, and magnify him for ever.

[" *Let this Psalm be said without* Gloria Patri, *throughout the whole year whenever it is said.*" *Sarum Psalt. p.* 60.]

[*Part III.*]

Psalm CXLVIII.

O PRAISE the Lord of Heaven: praise him in the height.

Praise him, all ye angels of his: praise him, all his hosts.

Praise him, sun and moon: praise him, all ye stars and light.

Praise him, all ye heavens, and ye waters that are above the heavens.

Let them praise the Name of the Lord: for he spake the word, and they were made; he commanded, and they were created.

He hath made them fast for ever and ever: he hath given them a law which shall not be broken.

Praise the Lord upon earth, ye dragons, and all deeps:

Fire and hail, snow and vapours, wind and storm, fulfilling his word:

Mountains and all hills; fruitful trees and all cedars:

Beasts and all cattle; worms and feathered fowls:

Kings of the earth and all people; princes and all judges of the world:

Young men and maidens, old men and children, praise the Name of the Lord: for his Name only is excellent, and his praise above heaven and earth.

He shall exalt the horn of his people: all his saints shall praise him; even the children of Israel, even the people that serveth him.

Psalm CXLIX.

O sing unto the Lord a new song; let the congregation of saints praise him.

Let Israel rejoice in him that made him, and let the children of Sion be joyful in their King.

Let them praise his Name in the dance: let them sing praises unto him with tabret and harp.

For the Lord hath pleasure in his people, and helpeth the meek-hearted.

Let the saints be joyful with glory; let them rejoice in their beds.

Let the praises of God be in their mouth; and a two-edged sword in their hands;

To be avenged of the heathen, and to rebuke the people;

To bind their kings in chains, and their nobles with links of iron.

That they may be avenged of them; as it is written, Such honour have all his saints.

Psalm CL.

O PRAISE God in his holiness: praise him in the firmament of his power.

Praise him in his noble acts: praise him according to his excellent greatness.

Praise him in the sound of the trumpet: praise him upon the lute and harp.

Praise him in the cymbals and dances: praise him upon the strings and pipe.

Praise him upon the well-tuned cymbals: praise him upon the loud cymbals.

Let everything that hath breath praise the Lord.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was, &c.

ON MONDAYS.

[*Part I.*]

Psalm LI.

HAVE mercy upon me, O God, after thy great goodness; according to the multitude of thy mercies do away mine offences.

Wash me throughly from my wickedness, and cleanse me from my sin.

For I acknowledge my faults, and my sin is ever before me.

Against thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight; that thou mightest be justified in thy saying, and clear when thou art judged.

Behold, I was shapen in wickedness, and in sin hath my mother conceived me.

But lo, thou requirest truth in the inward parts, and shalt make me to understand wisdom secretly.

Thou shalt purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.

Thou shalt make me hear of joy and gladness, that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice.

Turn thy face from my sins, and put out all my misdeeds.

Make me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me.

Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me.

O give me the comfort of thy help again, and stablish me with thy free Spirit.

Then shall I teach thy ways unto the wicked, and sinners shall be converted unto thee.

Deliver me from blood-guiltiness, O God, thou that art the God of my health; and my tongue shall sing of thy righteousness.

Thou shalt open my lips, O Lord, and my mouth shall show thy praise.

For thou desirest no sacrifice, else would I give it thee; but thou delightest not in burnt-offerings.

The sacrifice of God is a troubled spirit: a broken and contrite heart, O God, shalt thou not despise.

O be favourable and gracious unto Sion; build thou the walls of Jerusalem.

Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifice of righteousness, with the burnt-offerings and oblations; then shall they offer young bullocks upon thine altar.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was, &c.

Psalm LXIII.

O God, thou art my God, &c.

(*As on Sundays*, p. 389.)

[*Part II.*]

Song of Moses.

I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.

The Lord *is* my strength and song, and he is become my

salvation: he *is* my God, and I will prepare him an habitation; my father's God, and I will exalt him.

The Lord *is* a man of war: the Lord *is* his name.

Pharaoh's chariots and his host hath he cast into the sea: his chosen captains also are drowned in the Red sea.

The depths have covered them: they sank into the bottom as a stone.

Thy right hand, O Lord, is become glorious in power: thy right hand, O Lord, hath dashed in pieces the enemy.

And in the greatness of thine excellency thou hast overthrown them that rose up against thee: thou sentest forth thy wrath, *which* consumed them as stubble.

And with the blast of thy nostrils the waters were gathered together, the floods stood upright as an heap, *and* the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea.

The enemy said, I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil: my lust shall be satisfied upon them: I will draw my sword, mine hand shall destroy them.

Thou didst blow with thy wind, the sea covered them: they sank as lead in the mighty waters.

Who *is* like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? who *is* like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful *in* praises, doing wonders?

Thou stretchedst out thy right hand, the earth swallowed them.

Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people *which* thou hast redeemed: thou hast guided *them* in thy strength unto thy holy habitation.

The people shall hear, *and* be afraid: sorrow shall take hold on the inhabitants of Palestina.

Then the dukes of Edom shall be amazed; the mighty men of Moab, trembling shall take hold upon them; all the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away.

Fear and dread shall fall upon them; by the greatness of thine arm they shall be *as* still as a stone; till thy people pass over, O Lord, till the people pass over, *which* thou hast purchased.

Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, *in* the place, O Lord, *which* thou hast made for thee to dwell in; *in* the sanctuary, O Lord, *which* thy hands have established.

The Lord shall reign for ever and ever.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was, &c.

[*Part III.*]

Psalms CXLVIII., CXLIX., CL.

(*As on Sundays*, p. 392.)

ON TUESDAYS.

[*Part I.*]

Psalms LI., LXIII.

(*As on Mondays*, p. 394.)

[*Part II.*]

Song of Hezekiah.

I said, in the cutting off of my days, I shall go to the gates of the grave: I am deprived of the residue of my years.

I said, I shall not see the Lord, *even* the Lord, in the land of the living: I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world.

Mine age is departed, and is removed from me as a shepherd's tent: I have cut off like a weaver my life: he will cut me off with pining sickness: from day *even* to night wilt thou make an end of me.

I reckoned till morning, *that*, as a lion, so will he break all my bones: from day even to night wilt thou make an end of me.

Like a crane *or* a swallow, so did I chatter: I did mourn as a dove: mine eyes fail *with looking* upward: O Lord, I am oppressed; undertake for me.

What shall I say? he hath both spoken unto me, and himself

hath done *it:* I shall go softly all my years in the bitterness of my soul.

O Lord, by these things *men* live, and in all these things *is* the life of my spirit: so wilt thou recover me, and make me to live.

Behold, for peace I had great bitterness: but thou hast in love to my soul *delivered* it from the pit of corruption: for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back.

For the grave cannot praise thee, death can *not* celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth.

The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I *do* this day: the father to the children shall make known thy truth.

The Lord *was ready* to save me: therefore we will sing my songs to the stringed instruments all the days of our life in the house of the Lord.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was, &c.

[*Part III.*]

Psalms CXLVIII.—CL.

(*As on Sundays*, p. 392.)

ON WEDNESDAYS.

[*Part I.*]

Psalms LI., LXIII.

(*As on Mondays*, p. 394.)

[*Part II.*]

SONG OF HANNAH.

MY heart rejoiceth in the LORD, mine horn is exalted in the Lord; my mouth is enlarged over mine enemies; because I rejoice in thy salvation.

There is none holy as the Lord: for *there is* none beside thee: neither *is there* any rock like our God.

Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let *not* arrogancy come out of your mouth: for the Lord *is* a God of knowledge, and by him actions are weighed.

The bows of the mighty men *are* broken, and they that stumbled are girded with strength.

They that were full have hired out themselves for bread; and *they that were* hungry ceased: so that the barren hath borne seven; and she that hath many children is waxed feeble.

The Lord killeth, and maketh alive; he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up.

The Lord maketh poor, and maketh rich: he bringeth low, and lifteth up.

He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, *and* lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set *them* among princes, and to make them inherit the throne of glory: for the pillars of the earth *are* the Lord's, and he hath set the world upon them.

He will keep the feet of his saints, and the wicked shall be silent in darkness; for by strength shall no man prevail.

The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces; out of heaven shall he thunder upon them: the Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his king, and exalt the horn of his anointed.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was, &c.

[*Part III.*]

Psalms CXLVIII.—CL.

(*As on Sundays*, p. 392.)

ON THURSDAYS.

[*Part I.*]

Psalms LI., LXIII.

(*As on Mondays*, p. 394.)

[*Part II.*]

SONG OF ISAIAH.

O LORD, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortedst me.

Behold, God *is* my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid; for the Lord JEHOVAH *is* my strength and *my* song; he also is become my salvation.

Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation.

And in that day shall ye say, Praise the Lord, call upon his name, declare his doings among the people, make mention that his name is exalted.

Sing unto the Lord; for he hath done excellent things: this *is* known in all the earth.

Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion: for great *is* the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was, &c.

[*Part III.*]

Psalms CXLVIII.—CL.

(*As on Sundays*, p. 392.)

ON FRIDAYS.

[*Part I.*]

Psalm LI., LXIII.

(*As on Mondays*, p. 394.)

[*Part II.*]

SONG OF HABAKKUK.

O LORD, I have heard thy speech, *and* was afraid: O Lord, revive thy work in the midst of the years, in the midst of the years make known; in wrath remember mercy.

God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount

Paran. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise.

And *his* brightness was as the light; he had horns *coming* out of his hand: and there *was* the hiding of his power.

Before him went the pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet.

He stood, and measured the earth: he beheld, and drove asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow: his ways *are* everlasting.

I saw the tents of Cushan in affliction: *and* the curtains of the land of Midian did tremble.

Was the Lord displeased against the rivers? *was* thine anger against the rivers? *was* thy wrath against the sea, that thou didst ride upon thine horses *and* thy chariots of salvation?

Thy bow was made quite naked, *according* to the oaths of the tribes, *even thy* word. Thou didst cleave the earth with rivers.

The mountains saw thee, *and* they trembled; the overflowing of the water passed by: the deep uttered his voice, *and* lifted up his hands on high.

The sun *and* moon stood still in their habitation; at the light of thine arrows they went, *and* at the shining of thy glittering spear.

Thou didst march through the land in indignation, thou didst thresh the heathen in anger.

Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, *even* for salvation with thine anointed; thou woundedst the head out of the house of the wicked, by discovering the foundation unto the neck.

Thou didst strike through with his staves the head of his villages: they came out as a whirlwind to scatter me: their rejoicing *was* as to devour the poor secretly.

Thou didst walk through the sea with thine horses, *through* the heap of great waters.

When I heard, my belly trembled; my lips quivered at the voice: rottenness entered into my bones, and I trembled in

myself, that I might rest in the day of trouble: when he cometh up unto the people, he will invade them with his troops.

Although the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither *shall* fruit *be* in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat; the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and *there shall be* no herd in the stalls:

Yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation.

The Lord God *is* my strength, and he will make my feet like hinds' *feet*, and he will make me to walk upon mine high places.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was, &c.

[*Part III.*]

Psalms CXLVIII.—CL.

(*As on Sundays*, p. 392.)

ON SATURDAYS.

[*Part I.*]

Psalms LI., LXIII.

(*As on Mondays*, p. 394.)

[*Part II.*]

SONG OF JONAH.

I CRIED by reason of mine affliction unto the Lord, and he heard me; out of the belly of hell cried I, *and* thou heardest my voice.

For thou hadst cast me into the deep, in the midst of the seas; and the floods compassed me about: all thy billows and thy waves passed over me.

Then I said, I am cast out of thy sight; yet I will look again toward thy holy temple.

The waters compassed me about, *even* to the soul: the depth closed me round about, the weeds were wrapped about my head.

I went down to the bottoms of the mountains; the earth with her bars *was* about me for ever: yet hast thou brought up my life from corruption, O Lord my God.

When my soul fainted within me I remembered the Lord: and my prayer came in unto thee, into thine holy temple.

They that observe lying vanities, forsake their own mercy.

But I will sacrifice unto thee with the voice of thanksgiving; I will pay *that* that I have vowed. Salvation *is* of the Lord.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was, &c.

[*Part III.*]

Psalms CXLVIII.—CL.

(*As on Sundays*, p. 392.)

This brings us to the Short Lesson, of which our Second Lesson takes the place. I have left out the variable Psalm of each day, which is, on Sunday, C., Mond. V., Tues. XLIII., Wed. LXV., Thurs. XC., Frid. CXLIII., Sat. XCII., and comes uniformly second in order; that is, after the XCIII. on Sunday and the LI. on Week-days. I have given the opening Versicles in brackets, as without the design suggested, and for convenience of reference, have inserted in *italics* and brackets the divisions into parts,—Part I., Part II., &c.

Now suppose that in Lent, say, when the Te Deum is not sung, a single Psalm is to be taken in its place after the First Lesson. The very first in the series, both on Sundays and Week-days, during this Season, is the Fifty-first Psalm, the great Lauds Confession in the East and West alike.* The Psalm, moreover, which has been habitually used in the Church of England in the place of the Te Deum in Penitential Seasons. In the "Primer in English,"—the second of Henry VIII. (1539)

* "This prolonged psalmody [Nocturnal or Matutinal] concluded, the *fifty-first* Psalm follows, as in St. Basil's time, with only a brief hymn intervening; and *then* succeeds that burst of Canticles, "and Lauds Psalms," properly so called (viz. the 148th—150th), which marks the opening of the day, and sends up from all created being the incense both of the Old and of the New Creation."—*Freeman's Principles of Divine Service*, p. 111.

it is prescribed at the end of Te Deum, that "*Between Septuagesima and Easter this Psalm following is to be said in the stead of Te Deum.*" "The li. Psalm." "Have mercy upon me, &c." And the same thing is repeatedly prescribed in Occasional Services, set forth in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. See, for instance, on pp. 520, 528, 541, and others, (Parker Edition), the following Rubric:

"Then, for the first lesson, shall be read one of the chapters hereafter following, or so much thereof as is appointed.

Exod. xiii., Exod. xv., &c., &c., &c.

After that, instead of *Te Deum laudamus*, that is to say, We praise Thee, O God, shall be said the li. Psalm: Have mercy upon me, O God, &c."

Or, suppose the series of Canticles be taken. This gives us, on Sundays, the Benedicite, the same as it now stands in our Prayer Book—*is generally used* during Lent, and was *prescribed* to be used during this season in the First Book of Edward the VI.* Then comes its corresponding Canticle for each day of the week—for all Week-days in the year not Festivals—unless the 51st Psalm should be preferred, which is no less available. And on Festivals, when the Litany is, according to the old rule, not to be said, the whole series for the day, beginning with the versicles immediately after the Te Deum, would be a most appropriate and edifying act of praise. No better canticle scheme could be devised, I believe, for the Days and Seasons when the Te Deum is not used, as it falls in so perfectly with our present usage, so far as this goes, and is sanctioned by the former use of our Mother Church of England.

I append, however, a scheme of Canticles alone, which is suggestive in respect of this particular feature of a Proper of the Time. It could, undoubtedly, be a good deal improved; but I

* *After the first Lesson shall follow* Te Deum laudamus, *in English, daily throughout the year, except in Lent, all the which time, in the place of* Te Deum, *shall be used* Benedicite omnia opera Domini, *in English, as followeth.*—[*Rubric before Te Deum,* 1 *Lit. Ed. VI.*, p. 30, *Park. Ed.*]

give it exactly as I find it in the III. Volume of the Parish Choir, p. 15; premising that it is from an old Psalter, of the date of 1532, and designed for Ferial Days, *i. e.*, Week-days and Sundays when Te Deum is not said.

Canticles on Ferials.

Sunday.

(1.) Isaiah 33, v. 2–11, "O Lord, ... lift up thyself."
(2.) " 33, v. 13–18, "Hear Ye, . . meditate terror."
(3.) Ecclus. 36, v. 12–18, "O Lord, ... eternal God."

Monday.

Isaiah 12, v. 1 to end, "O Lord, I . . . &c."

Tuesday. (Hezekiah's Song.)

Isaiah 38, v. 10–21, "I said . . . house of the Lord."

Wednesday. (Hannah's Song.)

1 Samuel 2, v. 1–11, "My heart . . . anointed."

Thursday. (Song of Moses.)

Exodus 15, v. 1–20, "I will sing . . . sea."

Friday. (Song of Habakkuk.)

Habakkuk 3, v. 2–19, "O Lord, . . . high places."

Saturday. (Song of Moses.)

(1st part.) Deut. 32, v. 1–22, "Give ear . . foolish nation."
(2d part.) " " v. 22–43, "For a fire . . . his people."

Sundays in Advent.

Isaiah 40, v. 10–18, "Behold, ... vanity," Glory, &c.
" 42, v. 10–16, "Sing . . crooked things straight." Glory.
" 49, v. 7–14, "Thus saith . . . . . his afflicted." Glory.

Feasts of Christmas, Circumcision, Epiphany, and Sundays between their Octaves.

Isaiah 9, v. 2—8, "The people . . . . perform this." Glory.
" 26, v. 1–13, "We have . . . . . works in us." Glory.
" 66, v. 10–17, "Rejoice . . . . . shall be many." Glory.

SUNDAYS IN LENT.

Jeremiah 14, v. 17–22, "Let mine eyes . . . . . with us."
Lamentations 5, v. 1–22, "Remember . . . . . as of old."
Ezekiel 36, v. 24–29, "For I will . . your God." Glory.

FROM EASTER TO TRINITY.

Isaiah 63, v. 1– 6, "Who is this . . it upheld me." Glory.
Hosea 6, v. 1– 7, "Come . . . . burnt offerings." Glory.
Zephaniah 3, v. 8–14, "Wait ye . . . . . afraid." Glory.

FEASTS OF SAINTS, APOSTLES, AND EVANGELISTS.

Isaiah 61, v. 6–10, "Ye shall . . . . . blessed."
Wisdom 3, v. 7–10, "And [the righteous] in . . . . his elect."
" 10, v. 17 to end, [God] "rendered to . . . . eloquent."

ON FESTIVALS OF ONE MARTYR, CONFESSOR, &c.

Ecclus. 14, v. 20, } "Blessed is . . . . . everlasting name."
and 15, v. 3-7, } Glory, &c.
Jeremiah 17, v. 7–9, "Blessed is . . . fruit." Glory.
Ecclus. 31 v. 8–12, "Blessed is . . . alms." Glory.

ON FESTIVAL OF MANY MARTYRS.

Wisdom 3, v. 1–7, "But the . . . . . burnt offering." Glory.
" 10, v. 17 to end, [God] "rendered to . eloquent." Glory.

APPENDIX C.

TABLE OF INTROITS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS OF THE YEAR.

As set forth, and printed along with the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, in the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, A. D. 1549.

1st Sunday in Advent	Psalm	1
2d " "	"	120
3d " "	"	4
4th " "	"	5
Christmas Day, 1st Communion	"	98
" " 2d "	"	8
F. of S. Stephen	"	52
" S. John, Evan.	"	11
" the Holy Innocents	"	79
Sunday after Christmas	"	121
Circumcision	"	122
Epiphany	"	96
1st Sunday after the Epiphany	"	13
2d " "	"	14
3d " "	"	15
4th " "	"	2
5th " "	"	20
6th " "	"	20
Septuagesima	"	23
Sexagesima	"	24
Quinquagesima	"	26
Ash-Wednesday	"	6
1st Sunday in Lent	"	32

2d Sunday in Lent	Psalm	130
3d " "	"	43
4th " "	"	46
5th " "	"	54
Sunday next before Easter	"	61
Good-Friday	"	22
Easter-Even	"	88
Easter-Day, 1st Communion	"	16
" 2d "	"	3
Monday in Easter Week	"	62
Tuesday "	"	113
1st Sunday after Easter	"	112
2d " "	"	70
3d " "	"	75
4th " "	"	82
5th " "	"	84
Ascension Day	"	47
Sunday after Ascension Day	"	93
Whit-Sunday	"	33
Monday in Whitsun-week	"	100
Tuesday "	"	101
Trinity Sunday	"	67
1st Sunday after Trinity	Psalm 119	*Beati immaculati.*
2d " "	"	*In quo corriget?*
3d " "	"	*Retribue servo tuo.*
4th " "	"	*Adhæsit pavimento.*
5th " "	"	*Legem pone.*
6th " "	"	*Et veniat.*
7th " "	"	*Memor esto.*
8th " "	"	*Portio mea.*
9th " "	"	*Bonitatem fecisti.*
10th " "	"	*Manus tuæ.*
11th " "	"	*Defecit anima.*
12th " "	"	*In æternum.*
13th " "	"	*Quomodo dilexi.*
14th " "	"	*Lucerna pedibus.*

15th Sunday after Trinity	.	Psalm 119	*Iniquos odio.*
16th " "	. .	"	*Feci judicium.*
17th " "	. .	"	*Mirabilia.*
18th " "	. .	"	*Justus es.*
19th " "	. .	"	*Clamavi in toto.*
20th " "	. .	"	*Vide humilitatem.*
21st " "	. .	"	*Principes persecuti.*
22d " "	. .	"	*Appropinquet.*
23d " "	. . . . .	Psalm	124
24th " "	. . . . .	"	125
25th " "	. . . . .	"	127
S. Andrew	. . . . .	"	129
S. Thomas, A.	. . . . .	"	128
Conversion of S. Paul	. . . . .	"	138
Purification of S. Mary, V.	. . . .	"	134
S. Matthias	. . . . .	"	140
Annunciation of the Virgin Mary	. . .	"	131
S. Mark	. . . . .	"	141
SS. Philip and James	. . . . .	"	133
S. Barnabas, A.	. . . . .	"	142
S. John Baptist	. . . . .	"	143
S. Peter	. . . . .	"	144
S. James, A.	. . . . .	"	148
S. Bartholomew, A.	. . . .	"	115
S. Matthew, A.	. . . . .	"	117
S. Michael and all Angels	. . . .	"	113
S. Luke, E.	. . . . .	"	137
SS. Simon and Jude, AA.	. . . .	"	150
All Saints	. . . . .	"	149

APPENDIX D.

SARUM USE.	BANGOR USE.	I. LIT. EDWARD VI.
Ad missam dicendam dum sacerdos induit se sacris vestibus dicat hymnum:	*Ad missam dicendam executor officii cum suis ministris se induant. Dum induit se sacerdos vestibus dicat hunc hymnum:*	*Upon the day and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the Priest * * * shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration. * * * Then shall the Clerks sing in English the Office, or Introit (as they call it), a Psalm appointed for that day.*
Veni Creator spiritus: mentes tuorum visita: imple superna gratia, quæ tu creasti pectora, *etc.* V. Emitte spiritum tuum et creabuntur. R. Et renovabis faciem terræ.		[The Lord's Prayer was inserted here, before the Collect, in 1604.]
Oratio: Deus cui omne cor patet et omnis voluntas loquitur, et quem nullum latet secretum, *etc., as in our office.*		Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, &c.
Deinde sequatur Antiph. Introibo ad altare.	*Deinde seq.*	*Then shall he say a Psalm appointed for the Introit: which Psalm ended, the Priest shall say, or else the Clerks shall sing,* or, (see further on where this Rubric properly belongs).
Ps. (xliii.) Judica me Deus, et discerne.	*Ps.* Judica.	
Tritus psalmus dicatur cum Gloria patri.	Gloria patri: sicut erat.	
Deinde dicitur ant. Introibo ad altare Dei, ad Deum qui lætificat juventutem meam.	*Ant.* Introìbo.	
Kyrie eleison. Christe eleison. Kyrie eleison. Pater noster, *etc.*	Kyrie eleison. Christe eleison. Kyrie eleison. Pater noster.	
*His finitis et, etc. * * accedat sacerdos cum suis ministris ad gradum altaris, et dicat ipse confessionem (capite inclinato. Bangor.) diacono assistente a dextris, et subdiacono a sinistris hoc modo incipiendo:*		
Et ne nos. Sed libera. Confitemini Domino quoniam bonus. Quoniam in sæculum misericordia ejus.		
Confiteor Deo, *etc.* Absolutionem, *etc.*		
Then, after several versicles and prayers,		

SARUM USE AND BANGOR USE.	I. LIT. EDWARD VI.
His itaque gestis in dextro cornu altaris cum diacono et subdiacono, Officium(1) *missæ usque ad orationem prosequatur: vel usque ad* Gloria in excelsis: *quando dicitur. Et post officium et psalmum repetatur officium: et postea dicitur* Gloria patri *et* sicut erat. *Tertio repetatur officium: sequatur Kyrie.*	*Then shall he say a Psalm appointed for the Introit* (etc., as above).
(YORK USE) *Deinde repetatur officium:* Kyrie eleyson, iii. Christe eleyson, iii. Kyrie eleyson, iii.	III. Lord, have mercy upon us. III. Christ, have mercy upon us.
(HEREFORD) *Tertio repetatur officium: dicto officio sequitur,* Kyrie eleyson, iii. Christe eleyson, iii. Kyrie eleyson, iii.(2)	III. Lord, have mercy upon us.
* *	
Gloria in excelsis Deo.	*Then the Priest standing at God's board shall begin,* Glory be to God on high.
Then follow immediately the	*The Clerks.* And in earth peace, &c.
Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the day.	Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.

(1) "(*Officium.*) More commonly called, in later years, the *Introit.* 'Introitus:' as in the Roman use. In the Milan or Ambrosian Missal, it is called *Ingressa.* For an account of its first institution and other particulars, see *Bona,* tom. ii. p. 48; and *Gerbert,* de Musica, tom. i. p. 100. These Introits, as is well known, were retained in the first revised Liturgy of K. Edw. VI."—*Maskell's Early English Liturgies,* p. 20.

Also, "This anthem before the Lessons [i. e. Epistle and Gospel] was called *Introitus* in the Roman Liturgy, *Ingressa* in the Ambrosian, or that of Milan, and in the English Church was formerly used under the name of *Officium* or *Introit.*" —*Palmer's Orig. Lit.* vol. II. p. 20.

(2) Upon certain Festivals these *Kyrie* were appointed in the English Church to be sung with several verses added to the original words. As, for example, upon the double feasts were to be sung either "Kyrie rex genitor;" or, "Kyrie fons bonitatis;" or, "Kyrie omnipotens pater," with two or three others, at the choice of the Precentor. As, for example:

Kyrie, rex genitor ingenite vera essentia, eleyson.
Kyrie, luminis fons, rerumque conditor, eleyson.
Kyrie, qui nos tuæ imaginis signasti specie, eleyson.
Christe, Dei forma humana particeps, eleyson.
Christe, lux oriens, per quem sunt omnia, eleyson.
Christe, quia perfecta es sapientia, eleyson.
Kyrie, spiritus vivifice, vitæ vis, eleyson.
Kyrie, utriusque vapor, in quo cuncta, eleyson.
Kyrie, expurgator scelerum, et largitor gratiæ, quæsumus propter nostras offensas noli nos relinquere, O consolator dolentis animæ, eleyson.—*Maskell's Ancient English Liturgies,* p. 23.

APPENDIX E.

THE PROANAPHORAL PORTION OF THE LITURGY OF S. CHRYSOSTOM.*

Answering to our Ante-Communion Office.

Deacon. Sir, give the blessing.

Priest. Blessed be the kingdom of the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, now and ever, and to ages of ages.

Choir. Amen.

Deacon. In peace let us make our supplications to the LORD.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. For the peace that is from above, and for the salvation of our souls, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. For the peace of the whole world, the stability of the holy Churches of GOD, and the union of all, let us &c.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. For this holy house, and them that in faith, piety, and the fear of God enter into it, let us &c.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. For our Archbishop N., the venerable Presbytery, the Diaconate in CHRIST, all the Clergy, and the laity, let us &c.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. For our most pious and divinely preserved Kings, all their palace, and their army, let us &c.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. That He would fight on their side, and subdue every enemy and adversary under their feet, let us &c.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

* Used by the whole Orthodox Eastern Church.

Deacon. For this holy abode, the whole city and country, and them that inhabit it in faith, let us &c.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. For healthfulness of air, plenty of the fruits of the earth, and peaceful times, let us &c.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. For them that voyage, that journey, that are sick, that labour, that are in bonds, and their safety, let us &c.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. That we may be preserved from all tribulation, passion, danger, and necessity, let us &c.

Choir. Lord, have mercy.

Deacon. Assist, preserve, pity, and protect us, O God, by Thy grace.

Deacon. Commemorating, &c., * * * let us commend ourselves and each other, and all our life, to Christ, our God.

Choir. To Thee, O Lord.

Priest, aloud. For all glory, worship, and honour, befits Thee, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now and ever, and to ages of ages. Amen.*

Then is sung by the choir the First Antiphon [*the Initial Hymn, or Introit being divided into three antiphona, the First consisting of a series of verses from the Psalms, in or out of their regular order, each verse being followed by a prayer, ending with "Saviour, save us"*].

Then is said by the Priest the following

Prayer of the First Antiphon:

"Lord our God, of boundless might, and incomprehensible glory, and measureless compassion, and ineffable love to man

* "This form of prayer was anciently common to both the east and west. It was known by the name of *Preces*, or *Pacificæ*, and, till the ninth century, appears to have been said immediately after the Kyrie [*i. e.* in the Western Offices] on days when the Gloria in Excelsis was not sung. In the Church of Milan these prayers are, at the present time, retained in the Sundays of Lent, by the Roman ritual, in modified forms, on Good Friday, and before the Gloria in Excelsis on Easter Eve."—*Neale's Holy Eastern Church*, vol. 1, p. 360.

look down, O LORD, according to Thy tender love, on us, and on this holy house, and show to us, and to them that pray with us, the riches of Thy mercies and compassions."

"*And after the Antiphon hath been sung, the Deacon comes and stands in the accustomed place, adores and says,*"

"Again and again in peace let us make our supplications to the Lord.*

Assist, preserve, pity, and protect us, O God.

Commemorating, &c.

Exclamation, For Thine is the strength, and Thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, Father, *&c., as before.*

Then in like manner the choir sing the Second Antiphon. [*This is of the same nature as the First, only the petitions inserted between the verses have reference to the Festival. As for example, on Easter Day,* "Son of God that didst rise from the dead, save us who sing to Thee Alleluia." *It ends with the Doxology, and the Hymn* "Only begotten Son," *as follows:*

"Only begotten SON, and Word of GOD, immortal, Who didst vouchsafe for our salvation to take flesh of the holy Mother of God and Ever-Virgin Mary, and didst without mutation become man, and wast crucified, CHRIST our GOD, and by death didst overcome death, being one of the HOLY TRINITY, and glorified together with the FATHER and the HOLY GHOST, save us."†]

Then is said by the Priest

The Prayer of the Second Antiphon.

LORD our GOD, save Thy people, and bless Thine inheritance: guard the fulness of Thy Church: hallow them that love the beauty of Thine house. Glorify them in recompense with Thy

* This is called the Short Ectene, which consists of the three phrases—"Again and again" "Assist, preserve," "Commemorating," with the *Exclamation;* which is common likewise to the Long Ectene consisting of ten, twelve, or more verses, as above.

† On Sundays, instead of the two first Antiphona, Typica are sung. The First Typica denotes the 103d Psalm; the Second Typica the 146th. But from Low Sunday to Trinity, Antiphona are recited instead of Typica.

divine power: and forsake not them that put their trust in Thee.

Deacon. Again and again in peace, &c.

Assist, preserve, &c.

Commemorating, &c.

Exclamation, For Thou art the good God, and the lover of men, and to Thee we ascribe, &c.

Then in like manner the choir sing the Third Antiphon, [*which is concluded with Troparia proper for the Day, i. e. short Hymns, like the one just given,* "Only begotten Son," *though not generally so long**].

Then is said by the Priest

The Prayer of the Third Antiphon.

"Thou, Who hast given us grace, at this time, with one accord to make our common supplications unto Thee: and dost promise that when two or three are gathered together in Thy Name, Thou wilt grant their requests: fulfil now, O Lord, the desires and petitions of Thy servants, as may be most expedient for them: granting us in this world knowledge of Thy truth, and, in the world to come, life everlasting."

And while the Third Antiphon is being sung by the choir, or if it be Sunday, the Beatitudes, when they come to the Doxology the Priest and Deacon * * * *make*

The Little Entrance.

Then the Priest saith secretly the Prayer of the Little Entrance—sundry Versicles, Responses, and ceremonies follow—Troparia are sung, and then

The Choir sing the Trisagion.

"Holy God, Holy and Mighty, Holy and Immortal, have mercy upon us," *five times.*

* On Sundays the place of the Third Antiphon is supplied by the Beatitudes, to the three last of which Troparia from the third and sixth Odes of the Canon for the day are subjoined. The *Canon* usually consists of nine Odes, and each Ode of—generally from three to five—Troparia.

Following this, in order,

THE EPISTLE AND GOSPEL.

Then is said a "Long Ectene," somewhat different from the one given in the beginning of this Office, concluding with the Prayer for the Catechumens, followed immediately by

THE EXPULSION OF THE CATECHUMENS.

I have given but a mere skeleton of this beautiful Office from THE LITTLE ENTRANCE (*i. e.* bringing in of the Gospel), *though up to that in full*, as my object in quoting this portion of the Greek Liturgy is to show the time and manner of introducing the *Introit*, or Initial Hymn in the Eastern Offices.

It will be perceived that should we begin our Liturgy with the Litany and at the end of this sing the Introit—consisting either of a Psalm, or the Beatitudes, or an Anthem appropriate to the Day—the Priest at the conclusion of this, going within the rails, and reciting the Collect for Purity as the Prayer of Entrance, which is certainly superior as such to the Greek Prayer* in this place, we should conform exactly to the order of the Greek Service. Indeed, this is precisely what we do now from the Litany on, only we sing the Introit in Tate and Brady's versification, instead of the words indited by the Holy Ghost.

I ought to remark that the passages in brackets, intermingled with the Rubrics, are additions of my own, in order to render their full meaning and force apparent, without your having the trouble of reference. These, in substance, however, as likewise the other portions of this Appendix, are derived from the valuable work, several times referred to in the foregoing pages, Neale's History of the Holy Eastern Church.

* "Master, LORD, and our God, Who hast disposed in Heaven troops and armies of Angels and Archangels, for the ministry of Thy glory: grant that with our entrance there may be an entrance of holy Angels, ministering together with us, and with us glorifying Thy goodness.

For to Thee is due all honour," &c.

COMMUNICATIONS

FROM

NON-EPISCOPAL DIVINES.

FROM A VENERABLE DIVINE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH (OLD SCHOOL).

My Dear Sir:

I have called on Mr. P., but he thinks the document you refer to is not circulated, though he has been for a fortnight expecting it. If I receive it in time, I shall read it with interest. I am glad the Episcopal Church is moving in that direction. That Church has a better government than any Protestant Church—forms that protect it against enthusiasm—and its danger lies on the side of formality. In England, after the Revolution, it lost to a great extent its spirituality. Some movement was required—they who made it were good men, I suppose, but philosophically they made it in the wrong direction. The Church has nothing to fear from enthusiasm—much from formal-

ism; and beside, by giving consequence to externals she endangered her existing position. Rome was in advance of her in that direction, and her people, if turned in that direction, would be in danger of going quite to Rome. If I were a sectarian, which I am not, and can never be, I should rejoice to see the Episcopal Church set up exclusive claims and adopt Catholic usages. She will even now get from the other sects some *gentlemen*, but never the masses; but with her Prayer-Book and forms, did she fraternize with and become more like other Protestants in charity, and in evangelical principles, she would make great inroads upon the common people. Our safety, as sectarians, I do not say as Christians, lies in her maintaining her exclusiveness and keeping us from intercourse and communion with her. The Episcopal Church can do much to conciliate and harmonize Protestant Christendom, but every movement in that direction will relatively tend to increase her influence and her numbers, and to diminish ours. This, the far-seeing men in the other denominations know, and fear much more the influence of the evangelical preachers in your Church than its ultra high churchmen. For myself, as I care much more for the Church of Christ than for any of its divisions, I am glad to see any where any indications of the revival of fraternal feeling,—first, because it is right, and secondly, because it is likely to improve the Christianity of the several sections. No Church can do so much by a course of conciliation, as the Episcopal Church, to benefit others,

or to benefit itself. Nothing is wanted on her part, more than by a practical exhibition of the charities of the Gospel, to bring herself into closer fellowship and more familiar intercourse with the other denominations. In that intercourse, and in the exercise of that feeling, the other sects hazard something—the Episcopal Church nothing. Her duty, and her growth, lie in the same direction; and never is a greater mistake made in a Protestant country than when a minister in your communion approaches as near as he can in doctrine and in ceremonies to the Church of Rome. If you are purposing anything in the direction you suggest, I am glad of it; not on account of the advantage it will be to the Church to which I belong, with respect to numbers or influence —but on account of the better spirit it would be likely to awaken in all the Churches, and the increase of conservatism it would be likely to produce in some of them.

The Latin Church is extending, and is likely greatly to extend in our country, and unless a better spirit and greater unity of action shall be brought about among the sections of the Protestant Church, no one can foresee the consequences. I shall be most happy should a more fraternal and catholic spirit be awakened among your people, and a corresponding course of action—and this, though I believe any change of that kind would increase the numbers and influence of your Church and diminish both in my own.

FROM THE SAME.

MY DEAR SIR:—

THE Memorial enclosed has reached me. It is refreshing to meet with the expression of sentiments so true and so becoming Christians,—and though they meet a response in my heart, I can hardly say that I expect any immediate practical effect therefrom, and yet I should be most happy should this movement be the inception of measures that under Providence shall lead to greater union among Protestants. Though I believe greater union would operate in favour of Episcopacy, still I should not the less favour it on that account. I have not time to say, nor could I say by letter, what I would say could I see you. I suppose the ordination question a greater impediment than any doctrinal differences. Though I am not a believer in apostolical succession, and though if I were, I should not know where to go to find it, still for the sake of union with Episcopalians, I wish we had in their estimation a claim as good as their own; that is to say, I wish we and the Baptists and the Methodists had received ordination through the Episcopal Church, or some other channel esteemed by them as valid as their own. But I do not see how that impediment can now be removed. I wish the Methodist Bishops were consecrated Episcopally for the reason I have stated—that of union; and that qualified candidates for the ministry were ordained by

them or by Episcopal Bishops, with the expectation that they would settle, if opportunity offered, in other Churches. But whether this, or any other practical measure, will prepare the way for bringing into harmony the fragments of the Protestant Church, I know not. There is enough of the love of sect, enough of the love of the Episcopal Church, of the Methodist Church, of the Baptist Church, of the Presbyterian Church, but not enough of the love of the Church of Jesus Christ, as such, to admit of fraternal intercourse and unity of action among these believers in a common Christianity and worshippers of a common Saviour. To me the prospects of the world are sad—the growth of the slavery power and its ultimate tendencies and designs—the mighty increase of Romanism, and the more mighty increase of it in prospect—the divisions, the selfishness, and want of vital piety among Protestants, are all ominous of evil—and I do not think it altogether absurd to apprehend that judgments are in store for American Christians, whose faith is to be purified, and whose love is to be rekindled by suffering. But come what will, we have this consolation, that God reigns,—and be the course of others what it may, let us, while labouring to raise the standard of piety among those with whom, in the providence of God, we are more specially called to labour, do what we can to abate existing prejudices in all, and rekindle in all that charity which is the bond of perfectness. Praying that God may preside over your deliberations, and

guide the decisions of the body with which you are called to act,

I am very truly yours, &c.

FROM A CONGREGATIONAL CLERGYMAN.

MY DEAR FRIEND:—

I AM thankful for the occasion which brings a friendly salutation from you. The Memorial had come to hand, and had been read with great interest. I was happy to see the evidence that some of your clergy had discovered this mode of employing the vast power of your Church, for the more efficient application of the Gospel to the perishing. I will give you my views on several points, as you request.

I. *The need for a ministry of limited literary acquirements.*

1. *Millions lie outside of the range of our Churches and preachers.* Our ministry is fully occupied with parish work. But millions remain outside of the parish, practically in heathendom. Our piety is sadly defective so long as it looks unmoved on those multitudes whom Satan may for ever hold, if we do not do something beyond "Church extension," and raising up a "well-educated ministry."

2. *God has given some of his servants* precisely the qualifications for this work. They have piety, zeal,

judgment; only not learning, nor the time to obtain it. And, if they should, it would raise their qualifications, and so their expectations.

3. *The results of our experience are strongly confirmatory of the importance of this principle.* Our colporteurs and our city missionaries are filling a sphere which the energy and zeal of Methodist itinerants never occupied so well.

II. *Collateral advantages of such a ministry.*

1. *It will employ much talent now wasted.*

2. *Your Church is in danger of losing the poor in this country;* and that is a loss no Church can afford to make.

3. *You will by it gratify your best people*, and attach them so much the more strongly to your Church.

4. *The reaction on the piety of the Church will be most favourable.* It will lead to an increased sympathy for the destitute; to increased personal exertions for their benefit, and to increased prayer and thanksgiving to God.

III. *The difficulties of the subject.*

1. "*It will degrade the ministry.*" That was strongly and sincerely urged when our colporteur movement commenced. But experience has removed all those fears. It is too late to fear the ministry of our Churches will go backward in scholarship.

2. "*You will encourage irregularities.*" The Episcopal control of such labourers can be much more rigid than ours. But we have experienced no serious evil resulting from our efforts in this direction. We

have organized a very rigid system of supervision. And it may be well for you to have an interview with Mr. Hallock, of the Tract Society, to ascertain minutely our system, or procure one of their little volumes of instructions to colporteurs.

3. *Your service* (*liturgical*) *appears to me not well adapted for this light-infantry work.* It demands a convenient apartment, a trained people, &c. On that point your own good sense will guide you. Nor could I judge how far the enemies to the enterprise would make a handle of your relaxing any degree of the rigid requirements of your service.

IV. *A plan.* 1. *Introduce a new branch of the diaconate*, known and understood to have no reference to advancement to the other orders. Not forbidding such advancement; but making the requirements (in case of desire for advancement) for admission to the higher diaconate as rigid as though the candidate were from the lay ranks.

2. *Institute a course of instruction of one year* for these evangelist deacons, conducted by the Bishops in their own Dioceses; or otherwise. You may get some good hints on the proper course of instruction from our brethren in France and Geneva. About this I will communicate farther, if it shall become desirable.

3. *Let these deacons be supported by a missionary fund.*

4. *Make the tests of doctrine, government, ritual, &c., as Catholic as possible.*

5. *Begin with an experimental class.* There will

probably be some friction with new machinery. Have it so small that you can closely observe it, and readily remedy any observed defect. Choose your men with great care and prayer. Eschew favouritism or place-making. Get the men who can do the work, and who will do it.

My prayers are with you for the most eminent success. Oh when will Zion appear to be what she is, one and not many!

I shall always be happy to hear from you, and to help you, when such a thing becomes a possibility.

FROM A BAPTIST DIVINE.

MY DEAR FRIEND:—

YOURS was duly received, but the Memorial has not arrived. I presume that I must know something of what you are thinking about, and will answer you at once, lest, in the pressure of the week, I may not be able to do it. I cannot write on a plan, but must put down things as they occur to me.

The present state of the Christian Church, and its relations to the world, is anomalous, and almost shocking to a Christian. Especially is this the case in this country. Here is no persecution; the Word of God is open; ministers more numerous than in any Protestant country, and *working* ministers than in any Papal

country, I presume. There is nothing visible to prevent the universal dominion of Christianity; and what is the result? The number of professors of religion is diminishing in all our sects. The Churches are coming to a stand for want of ministers. There is hardly a distinction observable between Christians and other men in practice, so far as all the forms of worldliness are concerned. The conscience of Christians, in too large a proportion of cases, is below the average of men who have no guide but natural conscience. Let a case arise in which Christians and other men come into contact, and the Christian will do things which an honourable man would despise. To ask an honourable man of no profession to be converted, meaning that he should be such a man as many whom he sees professing Christianity, would be, frequently, hardly less than insulting. Hence, infidelity abounds and waxes strong. Humanity is rather showing itself out of the Church than in it. Men care more for their political parties than for the precepts of Christ; and on every political question, in Congress and out of it, sacrifice the one to the other.

This is abnormal. Christ and his Apostles never contemplated it. In twenty or thirty years, at the present rate of diminution, the candlestick will be removed out of its place.

What is the cause? Bear with me while I suggest a few things.

1. The wrong notions of the ministry. We are mad on a learned ministry. We shut out all but quasi

learned men, and thus make a ministerial caste. The result is that the laity leave all the work of religion to the clergy; they doing nothing but going to church and paying the bills. The masses of our Churches are perfectly quiescent; and they consider it their duty to be so. This is wholly in opposition to the principles of Christianity. *It* demands that the whole mass be individually active; all engaged in the same design—the conversion of the world; this taking precedence of everything else. Our notions of the ministry break all this down.

2. We are blessed with a large supply of very small men, who suppose that this ministerial office makes them great. Hence they magnify its importance, while they are rendering it perfectly effete. They have no professional enthusiasm; their labour is to build up a good society, have a good edifice, good singers, *respectable* hearers, and a comfortable living. The Church has no conversions, and no hold on the masses. The most successful church building is that which excludes the poor by necessity.

This, I believe, is caused to a great degree by the education societies. The ministry has become eleemosynary, and able men keep out of it. It is the resort of moderate men, who, thus brought up, bow before wealth, and are destitute of all moral courage. But what is to be done?

1. Rouse the masses, and set as many as possible to preaching. Break down this notion of clerical assumption and priesthood, and show every man that

he must be a propagandist of Christianity. I send you a sermon, preached a year ago, lest I should have not sent it before. This gives my views on this point.

The Episcopal Church has been considered as the head of the view which I deplore. If you can turn and strike for the masses, and honestly labour for the poor, and set your people in earnest for advancing Christianity, you will have the first goings in. You will revolutionize the American Church by your example. You have some facilities for it. You have an order of deacons. I would carry this out to the utmost, and have lay-deacons—that is men, engaged in other work, who preach and labour.

You have responses involving the principle that the whole congregation unites in worship. I would extend this to congregational singing. I would have several deacons in every Church, labouring in the outskirts, and among the poor, establishing thus new Churches, or leading men to the old ones. I would render it easier to enter the ministry, by encouraging ministers to take students and keep them out of the seminaries, which make anything but pastors and real working ministers.

If you can carry this, the other denominations must follow you; and I believe a new era will arise. Our sermons are general abstract discussions that, except by miracle, could convert no one, for they never mean to. It is as bad as reading a lecture on caloric to put out a house on fire. Christianity bows to

the ground before the world, and receives her reward. She casts her pearls before swine, and they trample them under foot (which is the meaning of the passage). There is no opposition, no persecution; for there is in Christianity nothing to oppose or persecute.

Such, in brief, is my view. I hope your Church will set the example. Coming from you, it would take us all in the flank, and would spread like wild-fire, or else you would eat us all up. If I can do anything, I will cheerfully co-operate with you. I do not know that I have written on the points you wish; but I know you must have heard and seen these things. Let me know how it strikes you. I will join hands with any one, and specially with you, in labouring for some new movement in our churches. If what we see is all Christianity *can* do, it is a failure. May God bless and prosper you.

FROM A GERMAN REFORMED CLERGYMAN.

To the Right Reverend Bishop A. Potter, D.D.

Right Reverend and Dear Sir:—

Your favour of the 22d of this month has come to hand this evening. I sincerely regret that you were prevented from making the intended visit to ———. I would be very happy, and I can say the same in behalf of Mrs. ———, if you could on some future

occasion carry out your recent intention, that we might speak more fully on the important topics to which you allude, as well as many other points of common interest.

And now I will endeavour, as far as the brief space of a letter will permit, to express my view, agreeably to your request, on the grave questions which are now before the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, and will claim the attention of the Commission of Bishops at their approaching session, in Newport. I venture upon the subject, with all modesty, of course, as a simple outsider, but with the kindest feelings towards your communion, which I always regarded as one of the most important branches of Christ's Kingdom on earth, and as holding a strong conservative, I may say, in some sense, a central position between the opposite extremes of Romanism and Ultra-Protestantism in this country. As regards the German Reformed Church, to which I more immediately belong, it stands, as it were, between the Episcopal and the Presbyterian bodies, and sympathizes to a very considerable extent with the Anglican theology and mode of worship. We are just now engaged in the preparation of a new Liturgy, for public and private worship. The Committee have spent much conscientious labour upon the subject, and proceeded on the principle of combining the best elements of Catholic worship, as far as they are not contradictory, but supplementary to the evangelical spirit (such as the Œcumenical Creeds, the Gloria in Excelsis, the Te Deum, the Litany, the

Collects, all revised from, and reproduced in, the spirit of the Greek and Latin original), with the most valuable liturgical productions of the Continental and English Reformation, critically sifted and occasionally altered or modified, without thereby excluding free prayer from public, and much less from private devotions, but rather as a general directory and regulator for both. Thus we may have, for instance, liturgical worship in the morning, and free prayer in the evening services; or Bible lectures, catechetical classes, &c. As soon as the work is completed, which I hope will be before the close of this year, I shall take great pleasure in sending you a copy, and should be happy to learn your views upon it. For it will be for the present simply a *Provisional* Liturgy, and thus be open to various suggestions, improvements, and alterations for several years to come.

As we thus make not only an individual, but even a denominational approach, in a certain sense, to a more liturgical mode of worship (in which movement we have the sympathies of some of the best and strongest men in the Presbyterian Church, although as a *body* they are as yet very decidedly opposed to all forms of prayer, from a deep-settled prejudice that they must necessarily tend to formalism), you can easily see that we must feel a deep interest in a movement in your Church, which seems to meet us half-way by an attempt to graft upon your liturgical system the advantages of evangelical freedom in the sphere of worship.

If I apprehend rightly the nature of this movement,

as explained in Dr. Muhlenberg's Memorial (a copy of which the venerable author had the kindness to send me some time since, but which, unfortunately, I must have lost by lending it away), it amounts to this, that the Protestant Episcopal Church, without giving up any of the advantages of her time-honoured form of government and worship, should yet relax the exclusive rigour of this form, and allow a sufficient amount of freedom to the clergy, to adapt the Church to the great mass of the people, instead of being confined almost, as is now too much the case, to a particular class of society.

If this is the nature of the movement, I would give it my hearty support, were I a member of your communion. It seems to me such a modification and extension of your system would be followed with no serious injury, and with very material benefits, of which I may be allowed to mention the following:—

1. It would give your clergy more freedom of action, bring them nearer to the people and their peculiar wants and ever-changing conditions, and act as a new stimulus upon their zeal, and favour the fullest development of their talents and activity.

2. It would increase the efficiency of your Church, and adapt it better to the spiritual wants of the large mass of our native and foreign born population.

3. It would especially secure, or favourably dispose, to you a very important, and perhaps increasing class of the religious community, which are dissatisfied with the unchurchly and unsacramental features of the

Puritanic denominations, and yet are so thoroughly anti-papal in their views and sentiments that any real or seeming approach in that direction repels them, so that they are deprived of a proper spiritual home.

4. It would do away with what I may be permitted to call the most objectionable features of the present Episcopacy in the eyes of Non-Episcopalians, who regard its rigorous exclusiveness and high claims, as ill-founded in history, as pedantic and uncharitable.

5. For this very reason, it would also prepare the way for a closer union amongst the Reformed Churches, and help to strengthen the cause of Evangelical Protestantism against the two opposite dangers of Romanism and infidelity.

Although I have no hopes myself of a speedy cure of the deplorable divisions in the visible Church, yet I pray for it most heartily, and am confident that every well-meant and wise effort in that direction will not be in vain. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was prepared, in various ways, several hundred years before it actually took place, and Christianity itself was preceded by four thousand years of positive and negative, direct and indirect, divine and human preparation, going back to the first promise of the victory of the woman's seed over the serpent's head.

If such an expansion of the Anglican Church is to take place, it must proceed from this country. But I am confident it will affect, in the end, the Mother Church, in England. The peculiar features of your government and discipline, the regular lay-representa-

tion in your Diocesan and General Conventions, have already the approbation of some of the most eminent Bishops and Divines of the Anglican Establishment (even the High Church Bishop, Wilberforce), who labour now, and will succeed ultimately, although not speedily, in restoring the self-government, with lay-representation, of the Church of England. I should think that corresponding modifications of your mode of worship will meet with similar favour, especially amongst the Broad Church School (I think they can hardly be called a party), as far as I may infer from personal intercourse with the late Archdeacon Hare, Professor Trench,* and others, and amongst the more liberal and enlightened of members of the High Church and Low Church Parties.

In Germany, and on the Continent generally, such a movement will be viewed in a favourable light, and will contribute to restore that harmony and kind feeling which existed in the sixteenth century between the Reformed Churches of the Continent and of England, a fact which, of itself, is sufficient to show that substantially they stand on the same basis, and should therefore co-operate for the same high ends.

* The great popularity of Trench's writings amongst Non-Episcopalians is owing partly to the very fact that he is free from all exclusiveness and pedantry, and yet perfectly sound and orthodox. He proves that one can be a devoted Episcopalian without unchurching Non-Episcopalian communions, and do the more good on that account. The same was the case with Archbishop Leighton, who, though dead, still speaketh.

Hoping that the Episcopal Commission, at their approaching Conference, may be guided by Divine Wisdom, and arrive at results which are calculated to promote the glory of God and the best interests of His Holy Catholic Church,

I am, with great respect, &c.

FROM A METHODIST DIVINE.

To the Right Reverend Bishop Potter.

Rev. and Dear Sir:—

Upon returning from the West a few days ago, I found your letter to me of the 16th inst.: also the printed Memorial that you directed your secretary to send, and which I understand you wish to be considered as a part of your communication to me. I have read both papers with very great pleasure; partly because they refer to matters that have often been suggested to my own mind, and which I have thought were of great interest to the Church of God; and chiefly because they indicate that the same matters have strongly attracted the attention of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Your letter and the Memorial present the same very important questions for consideration, viz.:—

1. "What steps *might* and *ought* (in my judgment)

to be taken by the Protestant Episcopal Church in order to make her more useful as an Evangelist to the ignorant and neglected?"

2. "And, also, as a peace-maker among the diverse and too hostile sections of Christendom at large, and especially Protestant Christendom?"

You ask what, in my judgment, *might* and *ought* to be done by the Protestant Episcopal Church, in view of these two questions. The frankness of your inquiry sets me at liberty to speak frankly. And to the first question.

I have always regarded the Church of England as the central frame-work and life of Protestantism in Great Britain and her dependencies: and I have regarded the Protestant Episcopal Church in America as containing the same elements of durability and life. But I have judged that the constant subjection of the Church of England to the supervision of the State, without sufficient independence of action in her ministry and officers, has very much curtailed her power to evangelize the people; because she presents herself to them not so much as the messenger and minister of God, as the agent of the State. She does not speak to them so much in love as by authority.

In this respect the Protestant Episcopal Church has the advantage of the Church of England in using her power for the evangelization of the people. She does not address them under colour of authority from the State, but as "moved by the Holy Ghost" to preach the Gospel to them. And yet I believe it is

generally conceded, that neither in England nor in the United States, has the Church fully accomplished her great mission to the masses of the people. She has not accomplished it even to the extent some other churches have done. I ask myself then, why has she failed when she has the essential elements of durability and life in her organization, in her teaching, and in her worship? The answer is,—She is hindered by external restraints. She is not at liberty to approach the masses of the people in her public service, in the places and under the circumstances in which they actually exist, and to speak and minister to them as their varied conditions require. She prescribes too rigidly the *manner* of her service at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances. She does not allow sufficient room and liberty for the heart and mind of the minister and of the man to speak out under the impulsive influences of the Divine Spirit and the inspiration of the occasion. She assumes that all the varied conditions of humanity are susceptible to her prescribed forms of worship; and does not sufficiently allow and direct that, retaining the substance of the faith, and observing the simple decency of religion, the particular minister and the local Church should add to her stated public worship such further service in public or in private as the condition of the congregation or of the family or the individual needing Divine aid, may require. This additional and extraneous service to be performed by the particular minister or local Church, at discretion

and in view of the circumstances, is the proper means of carrying the Gospel into the midst of the masses, and applying it to their hearts. It is the militant department of the Church, and is designed for conquest, in order to bring the people whom it may influence into the region of the regular and well-ordered Church. Here it is that by her excellent government and order, and by her Scriptural and beautiful Liturgy, the Church is admirably calculated to cherish and edify those whose hearts have been drawn to her, or whose civil and Christian education lead them to attend upon her public worship.

If these views be correct, and they are the products of much thought for years past, the problem which I judge the Protestant Episcopal Church is called to solve, is this, viz.: To preserve her essential ecclesiastical organization and her order of public worship, as her central frame-work and life; and yet allow and encourage individual ministers and Churches to add to her stated public worship, in the congregation assembled in the Church, and in other places, and in private families, or in respect to individuals, such discretionary services as they may be prompted to perform by their own feelings and judgment in view of each case.

I am of opinion that this problem could be solved very easily and with great advantage to the Church. Nor can I see that any evil or embarrassment need come. It would not be necessary, in my judgment, to prescribe any particular rules for these services.

What they should be, and how they should be conducted, might well be left to the discretion of the minister and his vestry, under the general oversight of the Bishop. All that would be necessary would be to formally recommend such a course, and to give it countenance in proportion as it was found to be profitable. To prescribe or enjoin these extra and discretionary services might be productive of harm. The minister or Church might be opposed to them: and if not opposed, yet might have no heart or tact in such services. The true plan is, to let these extra discretionary services spring out of the local wants and prevailing feeling and spirit in each church and congregation. In this way the life of the Church would be manifested under the restraints and direction of her fixed order and worship, and under the impulses and liberties of the heart and the occasion. External decency and internal growth would be obtained.

Before I dismiss this first and main question, I will add: So firmly have I been convinced of these views, that I have occasionally mentioned them to our ministers and chief members, and to our Bishops; suggesting that our services were too exclusively extempore and impulsive: that while we should preserve the freedom and earnestness which have characterized us as a Church, and given us great popular influence, we yet needed a more formal and stable *public service*, in view of the culture of the vast multitudes now attending upon our ministry. I am of

opinion that the Methodist Episcopal Church will yet provide a liturgy for her people, to be used in public worship by those local churches which may prefer to have a stated morning and evening service. And if we can retain our peculiar freedom and earnestness in the department of preaching, and in other services adapted to the varying wants of the people, and add to these the precision and stability of a liturgical service in the congregation, we shall have done for our Church what I judge ought to be done for the Protestant Episcopal Church to give her greater efficiency among the masses. I have mentioned our own Church for two reasons: *First*, to indicate that the question is one of *growth* in every church, and will make itself respected; *Secondly*, to show you the difference between our Church and yours on the question in hand, viz.: you have the permanent public service, and are required to provide for the discretionary; we have, essentially, the discretionary services, and are required to provide the permanent public service. Success in either case will be attended with great good; but I am inclined to think that your Church would accomplish more in this way than ours; because you have the prestige of history, authority, and position.

The second question is one of no less importance, and is of more general interest than the first: and yet it is one of some delicacy. I will be frank in regard to this also.

The *Circular* looks to the Protestant Episcopal Church becoming the "central bond of union among

Christians;" and you suggest whether or not she may become "a peace-maker among the diverse and too hostile sections of Protestant Christians." These quotations are pregnant with a great and glowing problem; and I may say, in the very outset, that I have been accustomed to suppose that, if it could be solved successfully at all, the central element in its solution would be found in the Protestant Episcopal Church. Being a direct off-shoot from the Church of England, and bearing in herself, as she does, the order, authority, doctrines, and forms of public worship of this Church which is the mother of the great mass of the Protestant Churches of this land, she occupies, historically, a central position in reference to this question. Her doctrines and forms of public worship, with the liberty and practice suggested in the preceding part of this communication, are sufficiently general in their terms to allow such varieties of opinion and practice as might well satisfy the general body of Christians.

But there is an almost insurmountable difficulty in the way of the solution of this great and interesting problem: and I will state it frankly. It is the prevailing exclusiveness of the Protestant Episcopal Church with reference to the validity of her ministry. There is a general, and I believe growing impression abroad, that the Protestant Episcopal Church is gradually settling down into the conclusion that the ministries of other churches are invalid, and that the Sacraments ought not to be received at their hands;

that the other Protestant Churches of this land are not sound, healthful Gospel or Scriptural Churches. And hence the constant avoidance on the part of the Protestant Episcopal Church, of any act or measure which tends to a recognition of any of the other Protestant Churches *as such*. My office calls me throughout the length and breadth of this land every year, and I have a good opportunity of observing the public sentiment and feeling on this delicate and vital point; and I am bound to say, this position of the Protestant Episcopal Church is deeply regretted, not only in view of the fact that the great body of the people are in fellowship with other Churches, and the community feel that they are well served and safe in this respect; but also in view of what every intelligent and observing mind must see is coming upon us, viz.: a fearful struggle between the Roman Catholic Church (which would annihilate us all) and the Protestant Churches. In view of this great contest, it is felt throughout the Protestant Churches, that it is a great misfortune that the Protestant Episcopal Church should put all the other Churches at fault by denying or refusing to accept the validity of their ministries. The other Protestant Churches do not call in question the validity of the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church; and they feel, but do not ask, that the validity of their ministries should not be called in question.

In answer to the question, then, viz.: How may the Protestant Episcopal Church become the "cen-

tral bond of union among Christians," and "a peace-maker among the Protestant Churches," I answer,—

First, Let her allow and advise the discretionary services suggested in the former part of this communication. This will modify her fixed prescribed position and form which exclude her now from the ever variously conditioned masses of the people, and bring her into the region of freedom and earnestness of action where the other Churches have accomplished much, if not most, of what they have accomplished. And in this respect she will be placed in sympathy with them; and they will be drawn toward her rather than she toward them, by the prestige of her order, authority, and position.

Secondly, Let her, while she prefers and holds as of best authority and most efficient, her own ordination and orders of the ministry, accept and respect the validity of the ministries in the other Protestant Churches. These I understand to have been the views of the English Reformers. They allowed the validity of the orders of the Reformed Churches on the Continent. Such a declaration, either by action or in form, would not in any degree invalidate the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but would bring her directly into the circle of sympathy of the other Evangelical Protestant Churches, from which, according to the common feeling, she now excludes herself. Coming thus into the sympathetic circle of the other Evangelical Protestant Churches, she would become the centre of them all by the same

order, authority, and position already spoken of. It would be the work of time, but surely she would thus become the "central bond of union among Protestant Christians" of this land. May I add without offence? She never can, in my judgment, attain this position, or render this great service in any other way. And if she fails in this high career offered to her, I do not now see how the "diverse and too hostile sections of Protestant Christendom" can be marshalled for the struggle which is evidently coming with the Roman Catholic Church.

If, Reverend and Dear Sir, I have spoken too freely, allow your candour and confidence, together with the magnitude of the subject, to be my apology. You are at liberty to use this communication, or any part of it, as you may judge best for the ends sought. The matter will be regarded as private, so far as I am concerned. If anything I have written shall contribute in any degree to solve the two questions you have proposed, I shall be thankful to God, the Author of all good.

May God grant you wisdom and grace for your many and arduous duties.

I am, Reverend and Dear Sir,

Yours respectfully.

June 30, 1854.

THE END.

STEREOTYPED BY E. B. MEARS. PRINTED BY C. SHERMAN & SON.

3477 7

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: March 2006

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

0 017 520 871 9